287.6756
M566in

ELON COLLEGE LIBRARY

Elon College, North Carolina

287.6756
M566in

792200

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/methodismalivein00ingr

METHODISM ALIVE IN NORTH CAROLINA

A Commemorative Volume for the Bicentennial of the First Carolina Circuit

O. KELLY INGRAM
Editor

792200

The First
JOINT SPECIAL SESSION
of the
North Carolina Annual Conference
and the
Western North Carolina Annual Conference
of the
UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

for the
Celebration of the
BICENTENNIAL OF THE
FIRST CAROLINA CIRCUIT

April 3, 1976 Cameron Indoor Stadium
Duke University

PROGRAM: "ON THE WAY"

10:00 a.m.

I. The Call of the two Conferences to be in session for this day, including the processional (led by Duke University Choir of 250, 20 pieces of brass, invited delegates from other churches, procession of banners from the oldest native American, black and white churches in the North Carolina districts). The opening hymn is "Christ, The Lord is Risen Today" by Charles Wesley and the congregation will join in singing this and other hymns. The two bishops will call the Conference together immediately after the Processional. Included in this first part will be a Litany of those who have preceded us in this pilgrimage, with special emphasis on Methodism in North Carolina for these 200 years.

At the close of this part of the day, The Bishops will address the Confirmation Classes on the importance of their decision for Christ and His Church. This part will end on the note that throughout the day we will reflect

on our heritage—where we have come from, where we are, and where we're going. The Duke Choir will sing an anthem based on Isaiah 6.

10:50 a.m.

II. The Troupe will gather for the enactment of our heritage. The first part of this section is written against the backdrop of our Biblical heritage: Dr. Joseph B. Bethea of Duke will dramatically portray in recitation "The Creation"—a very brief roll call of people on the way in the Old Testament, leading to the Christ event as introduced by Jean Stockton and immediately followed by Lou Verna Moses singing "Amen, Amen" with the congregation joining in. Then a roll call of the saints and martyrs, of people on the Way, from the first to the 18th century. The major part of this morning will be on John Wesley and the introduction of Methodism into North Carolina. The theme of The Carolina Circuit will be introduced, along with Francis Asbury as "the prophet of the long road." There will be parts of sermons, diaries, etc. along with authentic music from the 18th century in North Carolina, and native instruments will be used.

12:10-1:30 p.m.

III. DINNER ON THE GROUND

1:30 p.m.

IV. The Agricultural and Technical University Gospel Choir will sing beginning outside at first, leading everyone back into the Indoor Stadium.

Continuing the re-enactment of our history, with stories from the frontier about religion and its impact. These stories are often poignant, humorous, and in colorful frontier speech—the stories will be interspersed with an 1813 song about the times and tribulations of being a Methodist. We will also portray a camp meeting. We will come into the 20th century, emphasizing Duke's fifty years of service to the Church, this state and region.

This will be a "multi-media" presentation. Often multi-media is viewed only as the film or slides, but it actually incorporates all media such as old photographs, etchings, acting, singing, sermons, vignettes, etc. for the proclamation of the Gospel.

Grace & Peace,
James Hull
Producer-Director

METHODISM ALIVE IN NORTH CAROLINA

A Volume Commemorating
The Bicentennial
Of The Carolina Circuit

Edited by
O. KELLY INGRAM

•

The Divinity School of Duke University
Durham, North Carolina
The North Carolina Conference and the
Western North Carolina Conference
The United Methodist Church

METHODISM ALIVE IN NORTH CAROLINA
Published in 1976 by The Duke Divinity School
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina
All Rights Reserved

Contents

INTRODUCTION—*O. Kelly Ingram* v

CHAPTER ONE
The British Background of North Carolina Methodism—*Frank Baker* 1

CHAPTER TWO
A Lesson from Methodist History: Reflections on How Methodism Survived Transplantation to the New World and Lived to Prosper in America—*Stuart C. Henry* 19

CHAPTER THREE
North Carolina Methodism from the Revolution to the War of 1812—*Larry E. Tise* 33

CHAPTER FOUR
Cokesbury School—*N. Fred Jordan* 49

CHAPTER FIVE
North Carolina Methodists in the Nineteenth Century: Church and Society—*Donald G. Mathews* 59

CHAPTER SIX
In Slavery's Shadow: North Carolina Methodism and Race Relations, 1885-1920—*Ralph E. Luker* 75

CHAPTER SEVEN
Black Methodists in North Carolina—*Joseph B. Bethea* 87

CHAPTER EIGHT
North Carolina Methodist Theology in Post-Bellum Nineteenth Century—*Robert T. Osborn* 99

CHAPTER NINE
Methodism and Higher Education in North Carolina, 1776-1976—*Albea Godbold* 115

FOOTNOTES 141

DEDICATION

To all who love
OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST
and worthily bear the name of
METHODIST,
This volume is affectionately dedicated by
The Editor.

As the centennial commemorative volume was dedicated let this bicentennial volume be offered.

Introduction

Shall the fire burn on until the world shall be
illumined with millenial glory,
And Christ shall come to 'claim the heathen for
inheritance,
And the uttermost parts of the earth for his
possession?'
If so, Methodism must gird itself for still
grander achievements.[1] (Verse form has been added.)

In those words, "grander achievements," L. S. Burkhead in the *Centennial of North Carolina Methodism* suggested the agenda for the celebration of North Carolina Methodism's Bicentennial. To the end that the second century might be marked by progress equal to that of the first century, he prayed:

> May God keep us one in doctrine, one in experience, and one in the effort to save souls! For then, may we hope, before another hundred years have passed away, the banner of Methodism will wave round the world, and her glad shout blend with the harmonies of heaven.[2]

It should be noted that the "fire" to which he referred was the "grand *secret* of the success of Methodism": Its doctrinal system; ". . . its spiritual life manifested in the happy Christian experience of its ministers and members"; and ". . . its methods of operation, which have grown out of its spiritual life."[3]

Burkhead saw the "secret" as a dynamism that produced observable results in the first hundred years of North Carolina Methodism and which, if allowed to operate the next hundred years, would produce result on an exponential scale that would lead to Christ coming to ". . . claim the heathen for inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." If allowed to operate, that dynamism would produce results that will multiply until the North Carolina story shall become the earth's story and, to use language of his from another context, ". . . one-third of all the church organizations, one-third of all the church edifices, nearly

Footnotes for the Introduction begin on Page 141.

one-third of all the sittings, and nearly one-fifth of all the church property . . ." ". . . round the world . . ." will be Methodist. This was the production story of the Church in the U. S. in its first century, and another hundred years of the same dynamism should produce results measurable only in global terms.

Further below we shall be concerned to show the inadequacy of these criteria of the church's success, but it is interesting to compare the production story of the second century of North Carolina Methodism with that of the first century, using Burkhead's categories. The fact is that the Methodists of the second century outstripped their forebears, although we will not claim for the former what Burkhead claimed for the latter: "The progress of Methodism is the most remarkable religious fact in the history of North Carolina and of the United States, which the first century of our national existence has developed."[4] Yet, without being immodest, we can say that our statistics surpass his:

	1876	1976
Pastoral Charges	150	1,142
Itinerants	150	1,642
Superannuates	19	259
Members	54,000	492,380
Sunday Schools	600	1,800*
Teachers	4,000	34,085
Children	30,000	89,801
Colleges	3	9
Value of Colleges	$125,000	$300,000,000*
Parsonages	55	1,150
Value of Parsonages	$ 76,000	$ 30,000,000*
Churches	660	2,000*
Value of Churches	$600,000	$247,499,293

*Estimates, hopefully educated.

If the "progress of Methodism /was/ . . . the most remarkable religious fact in the history of North Carolina . . ." in the first century of its life, judged by Burkhead's standards, the progress of Methodism in the second century was even more remarkable. And, if the comparable figures for the AME, the AME Zion, and CME churches are included, the progress would appear to be astronomical.

Numerical progress such as that listed above would be cause for uninhibited celebration if we could be confident in attributing

it to a "grand secret" defined in terms of doctrinal truth, fervent religious experience, and efficient organization. The statistics alone are heartening, although the story of the last fifteen years is not as encouraging. Still, the second century of North Carolina Methodism may have been more of a booming "success" than the first. The problem is that these marks of success very well may be as much the badge of the church's shame as its success. They may testify to the efficiency with which Methodism accommodated itself to the economic, political, social and racial norms of North Carolina society.

One of the recurrent themes of this book, struck by Stuart Henry, Larry Tise, Donald Mathews and Robert Osborn, each of whom did his research independently of the others and arrived at his conclusions in the same independent fashion, is that Methodism in North Carolina followed *the classical movement from sectarian to churchly status, from a religion of the poor and the powerless to a religion of the well-to-do and powerful.* The reason Methodists of both centuries were "successful," according to this thesis, was that they engaged in the necessary accommodations to the prevailing culture. Without that acquiescence to what the society expects of those institutions that can be considered "in" the Church would not have enjoyed popular acceptance.

The earliest and most obvious accommodation to social expectation was in regard to the slavery issue. The Christmas Conference of 1784 adopted a rule requiring members to free their slaves. As obviously right as that rule appears to us today, it became equally obvious to the itinerants a year after they adopted their anti-slavery stance that they could not spread Methodism in the South with a law that ran as counter to the prevailing norms as that rule did. It was rescinded to make "success" in statistical terms possible.

"Christendom has often achieved *apparent success* by ignoring the precepts of its founder," wrote H. Richard Niebuhr. "The church, as an organization interested in self-preservation and in the gain of power, has sometimes found the counsel of the Cross quite inexpedient. . . ."[5] Christians are under mandate to interact with the world, leavening its institutions with the special yeast of the gospel, but they have found the interaction easier when they have paid their worldly dues and presented the yeast in socially acceptable packages. Stuart Henry in Chapter Two traces the movement of early North Carolina Methodism from sect to church,

from *outré* status in society, not conforming to conventional behavior, customs, and styles, to a socially acceptable church.

Part of the dues one had to pay to the world of the newly founded American republic for the privilege of exercising influence was political. In Chapter Three Larry Tise shows how the Methodist itinerants were affected by the political struggle going on between the Federalists and the Jeffersonians. Methodism alive in North Carolina, as the title of this book suggests, was interacting with a socially and politically disorganized society. It was, as Tise observes, a "religious phenomenon, a social philosophy, and a system of social organization that meshed with or responded to one or another of the national political currents." Especially the O'Kellyite schism was rooted in this reciprocity with political currents, for clearly the republican sentiments of James O'Kelly mirrored those of the anti-federalists. Tise sees this negotiation of *outré* Methodism with North Carolina political, social and economic phenomena as culminating in the full acceptance of the Methodist Episcopal Church into North Carolina society but only after it had paid its membership dues in the form of compromise.

H. Richard Niebuhr pointed out that the distinguishing features of a denomination are to be found in its conformity to its social class.[6] This is not to say that it is not religious. It is religious, but it has accommodated itself to the culture in which it functions. "They /denominations/ are emblems . . . of the victory of the world over the church, of the secularization of Christianity, of the church's sanction of that divisiveness which the church's gospel condemns."[7] Religion, economics, politics and racial factors operate within society mutually influencing one another. The denomination is one part of the interaction, and the character of the denomination rising from the interpenetration of systems is explicable only if the influence of each of the factors is taken into consideration. Compromise of its sectarian genius is the price of the sect's social acceptance.

Donald G. Mathews in Chapter Five shows how nineteenth century Methodism began as a ". . . people who were politically powerless and socially demeaned . . ." and who were at war with the world and ended as a people who had become ". . . more like the world as the world became more like the church." In order to move from a membership of eight thousand to a membership of 140,000 in the course of a century, North Carolina Methodism had to become a ". . . bastion of white middle class respectability," no longer at odds with the world.

One of the factors H. Richard Niebuhr cites as interacting with any sect-church system is the influence of racial issues. They have had more influence in molding the character of North Carolina Methodism in all departments of its life than any other factors. Ralph E. Luker's chapter represents a departure from the socially "out" and "in" "sect-church" thesis. Instead, he traces the ways in which white Methodists related to black Methodists in North Carolina between 1885 and 1920. While he covers only a portion of the *post-bellum* period and does so in a way not immediately and entirely congruent with the chapters of Henry, Tise and Mathews, his chapter provides the backdrop against which *post-bellum* Methodism in North Carolina will be seen when viewed objectively. "In Slavery's Shadow" very well might be the title of a history of North Carolina Methodism.

The chapter of Robert Osborn on theology in *post-bellum* North Carolina Methodism illustrates Niebuhr's perception of the difference between the religion of the poor and that of the comfortable. To describe that difference Niebuhr quotes Ernst Troeltsch:

> 'The really creative, church-forming religious movements are the work of the lower strata. Here only can one find that union of unimpaired imagination, simplicity in emotional life, unreflective character of thought, spontaneity of energy and vehement force of need, out of which an unconditioned faith in a divine revelation, the naïvete of complete surrender and the intransigence of certitude can rise! . . . Simple and direct in its apprehension of the faith, the religion of the poor shuns the relativizations of ethical and intellectual sophistication and by its fruits in conduct often demonstrates its moral and religious superiority.'[8]

Niebuhr goes on to say, "Whenever Christianity has become the religion of the fortunate and cultured and has grown philosophical, abstract, formal, and ethically harmless in the process, the lower strata of society find themselves religiously expatriated by a faith which neither meets their psychological needs nor sets forth an appealing ethical ideal."[9] Osborn argues that there were two Methodist theologies in *post-bellum* North Carolina, black and white. That of the black Methodists (in keeping with Troeltsch's conception of the religion of the lower strata) was literal, spontaneous, informal and ethically relevant to the character of the black man's lot in life, while that of the white Methodists was ". . . philosophical, abstract, formal, and ethically harmless . . .," to use Troeltsch's language. In both cases, the church's unique character was the result of its "conformity to the order of /its/ social class" in accordance with the theory propounded by H. R. Niebuhr.

Four chapters of *Methodism Alive in North Carolina* demonstrate the ways in which the demands of the prevailing psychology and the need to conform to then ineradicable norms enforced by economic interests played ". . . their role in the definition of religious truth."[10] Most previous histories of North Carolina Methodism have not taken the interpenetration of systems into account, but a history that proposes to deal with causes as well as effects must employ this wide-angle vision.

One other comment needs to be made concerning any church's interaction with the world. In the very act of taking on responsibility for something outside its own internal environment the religious body inevitably begins to involve itself in compromise. Such compromise has been characteristic of the entire history of the church, for church extension is the church carving a niche for itself in the world, and, no matter how tough the chisel, it leaves some of itself on the object it carves. Every Christian must adapt the gospel's demands ". . . to the necessities of existence in the body and in civilized society."[11] We could go one step further and observe that Christology has been one of the thorniest problems for the theologians because some of them have suspected that the incarnation necessarily entailed agonizing—if not unacceptable—compromises for God, ". . . for no ideal can be incorporated without a loss of some of its ideal character."[12]

In an upwardly mobile church, as Methodism has been throughout its entire history, there have been requirements for compromise at the point of each accommodation, and there have been many accommodations. This book has dwelt mostly on those of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but they have been coming even thicker and faster in recent years than ever before. Witness accommodations to the rights movements, populist sentiments, and liberated sex views, to mention only a few. Not all accommodations involve evil compromises. Some represent reactions against the evils of earlier compromises, but some of the yielding to pressures today will be judged evil by tomorrow's historians. They will insist that we should have resisted "to the blood" before accepting some of our compromises.

The inevitability of compromise may lessen our culpability, but it does not mitigate the evil consequences.[13] As H. R. Niebuhr says, we compromise too soon:

> . . . men must continue to condemn themselves not only for their failure to do what they could, but also for their failure to perform what they could not, for their denial of the absolute good whose categorical demands were

> laid upon their incapable wills. But compromises are doubly evil when they are unacknowledged, when the emasculation of the Christian ideal remains undiscovered and when, in consequence, men take pride, as in an achievement, in a defeat of the essential gospel. Such unconscious hypocrisy not only bars the way to continued efforts to penetrate the stubborn stuff of life with the ethics of Jesus but is the author of further compromises made all too early. So it produces at last a spurious gospel unaware of its departure from the faith once delivered to the saints.[14]

North Carolina Methodism hopefully after two centuries has achieved such a degree of Christian maturity that it can transmute Burkhead's desire for "grander achievements," according to his definition of success, into a concern for outreach that will avoid compromise coupled with "unconscious hypocrisy." If so, two things must the church do: First, it must be prepared to live out a commitment to Christian social objectives that transcend the particularities of North Carolina's aspirations in the moment. And, secondly, it must not take, as its presiding purpose, its own self-preservation and growth in the world.

No reference has been made to four other chapters in *Methodism Alive in North Carolina*. Frank Baker's "British Antecedents . . ." represents the most exhaustive treatment of colonial North Carolina Methodism yet undertaken. With exquisite attention to detail he has put together the available data in what surely will be the first chapter in a reference book on the annals of the Church in this state. History told in the style that illustrates the Niebuhr thesis falls into disrepute without history that takes data seriously as Frank Baker has in his chapter.

Fred Jordan's chapter on "Cokesbury School" is a charming vignette lifted from North Carolina Methodist history for the enchantment and entertainment of the reader. At the same time, the chapter chronicles an event that distinguishes the Church in this state. Cokesbury School probably was a "first," and, as such, its story needs to be told, and preferably by one who has had access to data of the kind Fred Jordan had at his disposal. This chapter also represents local history, a kind of history that Methodists across the state should be doing.

"Black Methodists in North Carolina" will not contribute to the white reader's equanimity. Joseph Bethea may not have set out to excoriate the white church. What he has done for the most part is to trace the origin and fortunes of black Methodist denominations in North Carolina. All too often, however, it is a story that does the white church little credit. Whites in North Carolina have been so preoccupied with their own comfort, with the stability of their

social institutions, and with their own racial aggrandisement at the black man's expense that they have failed to respond to the real needs of their black brothers and sisters. Alas, this too is North Carolina Methodist history.

L. S. Burkhead could boast that in 1876 North Carolina Methodism had three colleges whose property was worth $125,000. If the assets of Duke University are included, today the institutions of higher education have assets exceeding $300,000,000. This represents the most marked progress of any of the church's concerns in the state. The magnitude of the financial commitment to higher education, if nothing else, has earned a right for the colleges to the kind of consideration Albea Godbold has given them in this bicentennial volume.

In 1973 Thomas A. Langford, Dean of the Divinity School of Duke University, was given a copy of the *Centennial of North Carolina Methodism*. Reading that book set the wheels of his imagination turning with the result that he initiated plans for the celebration of 1976 as the Bicentennial of the Carolina Methodist Circuit. He proposed that I edit a book dealing with the history of North Carolina Methodism and chair a committee to plan for a joint special session of the two North Carolina annual conferences of the United Methodist Church at Duke University for the purpose of celebrating the Bicentennial. With his continued advice and encouragement and the patient labors, in season and out of season, of the contributing authors, the book has been prepared and is presented as part of the celebration of two hundred years of North Carolina Methodism.

O. Kelly Ingram
Editor

February 1976

CHAPTER ONE

The British Background of North Carolina Methodism

FRANK BAKER

In 1735 John Wesley came out to Georgia as a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts—the "S.P.G." Georgia was a mere infant in age, but the older North Carolina was only a little more advanced. Although discovered in 1524 and briefly settled by Sir Walter Raleigh in 1585, efforts to colonize the area were dogged with difficulty even after Charles II had granted it by charter to Lords Proprietors in 1663. Even when the colony was transferred to the Crown in 1729 the entire population was less than forty thousand, and was almost confined to the tidewater area.[1] Here there had been an attempt to reproduce the modest culture of an English country town in the three boroughs which numbered over sixty families—Bath, New Bern, and Edenton, to which in 1735 was added Wilmington, and in 1745 its slightly older neighbour across the Cape Fear River, Brunswick.[2] Most of the population, however, was scattered in much smaller communities—using this term to include a dozen log cabins dotted along a few miles of creek—or lived a day's journey from their nearest neighbour. All were nominally members of the Church of England, even though a few declared themselves dissenters. The clergy were for the most part much like Wesley himself at this time,

Chapter One, THE BRITISH BACKGROUND OF NORTH CAROLINA METHODISM was written by Frank Baker, Ph.D., Professor of English Church History, Divinity School, Duke University, and Editor-in-Chief of The Oxford Edition of Wesley's Works.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 141.

younger men with a genuine concern for their scattered parishioners, among whom they made extended pastoral tours, holding services at preaching points which ranged from the rare brick parish church, through wooden chapels of ease, to the log cabins of friendly planters. Actually in 1729 the Rev. James Blair reported that there was not a single clergyman in North Carolina,[3] and sixteen years later there were only two, James Moir in the south and Clement Hall in the north, who from their bases in Wilmington and Edenton served the whole east coast.[4] In 1741 the colony was divided into sixteen parishes, which were roughly co-extensive with large counties, most of which were later subdivided.[5] Churches had been built only in Bath and Edenton, though there seem to have been a handful of wooden chapels belonging to the Church of England. Clergy remained few in number, and there were still only four officiating in 1741.[6]

In spite of a tradition that Wesley preached in one of the colonial chapels in North Carolina,[7] he never set foot in the colony, though he knew Charleston, South Carolina, fairly well. Sailing out on the *Simmonds* with him in 1735 had been the son of Robert Johnson, the Governor of South Carolina,[8] and as a missionary he soon became aware of the encroachments into Georgia of unlicensed traders from both South and North Carolina.[9] On July 26, 1736, while traveling to Charleston with his brother Charles, who was returning to England, he spent some hours reading an "account of Carolina."[10] Charles' report to the Georgia Trustees claimed that Georgia was suffering greatly from the unneighbourly conduct of the inhabitants of the two Carolinas, going so far as to charge them with trying to seduce settlers away from Savannah, with persuading the Indians to abrogate their agreements with Oglethorpe, and even with inciting the Spanish at Fort Augustine to attack them.[11] It was also to Charleston that John Wesley came in order to print his *Collection of Psalms and Hymns* (1737), apparently the first hymnbook (as opposed to a collection of psalms only) to be published on the American continent.[12]

John Wesley's pupil, friend, and colleague, George Whitefield, one of the last to join the group of Oxford Methodists, and the one who kept the term "Methodist" alive in America for a generation, came to know North Carolina fairly well. It is clear, however, that he was not enamoured of the province. The swampy coastal plain, with its shallow, shifting sounds, was a hazard to be endured by venturesome travelers between Virginia and South Carolina rather than a paradise for settlers. The week's journey

along three hundred miles of unmarked, unpaved road necessitated several voyages by irregular ferries, a succession of guided expeditions through almost impenetrable forests, the traversing of swamps and the crossing of bridges which were constantly being swept away by storms and floods. Whitefield traveled that arduous and treacherous north-south road on at least six occasions.

The first was in December, 1739. At "Eden Town, a little place, beautifully situated by the waterside," he was well entertained at a public house, but did not preach. At Bath, reached by the worst roads he had ever met, through wet, swampy, and uninhabited territory, the Rev. John Garzia welcomed him to preach in St. Thomas' Church on Sunday, December 23, to nearly a hundred people—five times the normal congregation. In the courthouse at New Bern on Christmas Day he attended worship and sacrament, bemoaning its perfunctory nature, and in the afternoon himself "read prayers and preached" to an attentive congregation, of whom "most were melted into tears." On Sunday, December 30, he "read prayers and preached, both morning and evening, in the courthouse" at "New Town on Cape Fear River," i.e., Brunswick, the port founded in 1727, which he spoke of as "a little but thriving place for trade." There were many Scots in his congregation.[13]

During Whitefield's third tour in America he again seems to have passed through North Carolina, in the winter of 1746 and the spring of 1747, though at least one of his unrecorded journeys between the north and Charleston may have been by sea. In the autumn of 1747, however, he made a deliberate effort to spend the better part of a month "hunting after sinners in North Carolina woods"—"this ungospelized wilderness," as several times he described it. In fact he gave up after spending less than two weeks here, writing from Wilmington on October 18, "I could write much, but am fatigued, having preached several times, and rode on horseback through the woods an hundred and sixty miles." His added comment, "Jesus makes the barren wilderness to smile," hardly compensates for the lack of his usual ebullience in the flat statement that he had preached "several times."[14]

Whitefield's fourth visit, in 1751-2, was spent mainly in Georgia and South Carolina. During his fifth, 1754-55, he seems to have passed speedily through North Carolina once. His sixth visit, 1763-5, brought him to North Carolina in November, 1764, when he "met with what they call 'New Lights' almost every stage," and interviewed "a wealthy planter" who was one of their leaders, as well as securing the names of a handful of their preachers.[15] On

this occasion he himself met with such a cordial reception that he decided to come back early in the spring. Accordingly he made another tour in March and April, 1765, yielding to importunities from the mayor of Wilmington and others to stay there a day or so longer in order to preach on Sunday, March 31. Governor William Tryon was present, and reported that Whitefield's sermon would have done credit in St. James', London.[16] He also preached at New Bern for the Rev. James Reed, who reported that "several that had been tinctured with the principles of Methodism came a great many miles to hear him," but were mortified to hear him castigate religious emotionalism not accompanied by holy living.[17] (Reed had been complaining since 1760 about the "Methodists" on the fringes of his parish, and found it difficult to accept Whitefield's assertion that these censorious antinomians had no right to the title, which belonged properly only to the followers of the Wesleys and himself; Reed insisted that at least these New England sectarians had sprung from the seed planted by Whitefield.)[18] This proved, in fact, to be Whitefield's last visit. He had founded no societies, he had not strayed from the normal north-south route, he had preached mainly in Anglican churches, he had not, apparently, been the means of any remarkable revival in North Carolina. Yet the magnetism of his name and the eloquence of his preaching, even when he was becoming stout and asthmatical, helped to keep alive a spiritual expectancy, a yearning for something more than a formal religion. He had indeed sown some seed even in North Carolina, seed from which abundant harvests were to be gathered by settlers of various denominations and of none, but especially by those other "Methodists" who owed their earthly spiritual allegiance to his older colleagues John and Charles Wesley.

When Whitefield first passed through North Carolina in 1739 its population numbered about forty thousand. By the time of his last visit in 1765 this had grown to about a hundred and twenty thousand, most of whom lived on the coastal plain, while the political leadership was firmly in the hands of the coastal elite. The Piedmont was rapidly increasing in importance, however, and the pre-revolutionary decade witnessed a mass influx which tripled the population.[19] A few inland communities were franchised as boroughs, thus being empowered to send their own representatives to the colonial Assembly: Halifax (1764), Salisbury (1765-6), Hillsborough (1773; originally incorporated in 1759 as Childsbury), and Fayetteville (1773; originally incorporated in 1762 as Campbellton).[20] Thousands of the new immigrants were Scots Presbyterians,

but there is no question that thousands also were from England or Ireland, and came with Methodist connections, or were at least amenable to the Methodist approach. There is no clear evidence of any organized Methodist society, however, before 1773, although during the preceding decade the settlers in general warmly welcomed the diversions afforded by the visits of Whitefield and of other less reputable itinerant preachers.

George Whitefield set sail for the last of his seven voyages to America in August, 1769. In the same month the first two of Wesley's itinerant preachers to be stationed in America also left England. (They were, of course, laymen, not ordained ministers like Whitefield.) These men, Joseph Pilmore[21] and Richard Boardman, spent the better part of two years alternating between Philadelphia and New York. Even after the arrival of reinforcements in the persons of Francis Asbury and Richard Wright, in October, 1771, they did not go much farther afield, as they had intended.[22] Not until May, 1772, did Pilmore set off, and even then with a measure of reluctance,[23] on a missionary tour of the south which lasted eleven months. Nearly seven months was spent in Virginia, mostly around Norfolk, where he founded and stabilized two healthy Methodist societies. After three of those months he paid an exploratory midweek visit to the north-east corner of North Carolina, preaching the first "official" Methodist sermon at Currituck courthouse on Tuesday, September 29, 1772, and after a few days returned to Virginia for a further two months. Then he ventured on an expedition down the east coast as far as Savannah and back, lasting almost four months, of which a total of over six weeks was spent in coming and going through North Carolina. For his journey he was armed with some letters of recommendation to hospitable people, but frequently he put up at inns, usually free of charge because he was a preacher. He found traveling in his horsedrawn carriage very difficult, and at times extremely dangerous. Even more distressing to him was the state of religion in the province, especially that of the Church of England, to which as a good English Methodist he naturally gravitated. In his Journal he recorded: "It is two hundred miles wide, and is settled near four hundred miles in length from the sea, and the Church established as in England; yet in all this country there are but eleven ministers!"[24] At Edenton he visited St. Paul's Church, describing it as "a poor, damp, dirty place, where they have only preaching once in three weeks." At Bath he "was glad to find a pretty little church, but this parish, like many others, has no minister!" He continued,

"I have passed through four counties, and am now in the fifth, and not one church minister in them all!"[25]

At last Pilmore came to New Bern, at this time the provincial capital. Here the picture changed. He attended the parish church on Christmas Day, and "heard a sensible and useful sermon." Not only so, but when he himself preached at the courthouse he had "the genteelest congregation" he had seen since leaving Philadelphia. He was invited to many homes, and "had the honour of dining with Mr. [Isaac] Edwards, Secretary to the Governor, where [he] was treated with the highest respect." He remained for five days, preaching on Sunday afternoon and every other evening in the courthouse to "genteel" crowds—the somewhat snobbish adjective keeps cropping up in his narrative. So carried away with emotion was he that when "a great multitude attended to hear [his] last sermon (for the present)" he "enlarged more than usual," adding a rapturous note in his Journal: "In all my travels through the world I have met with none like the people of Newburn! Instead of going to balls and assemblies as people of fashion in general do, especially at this season of the year, they came driving in their coaches to hear the word of the Lord, and wait upon God in his ordinances!"[26]

This was one bright exception, however, and did not cause Pilmore to alter his general opinion about the spiritual poverty of North Carolina. The sharp contrast at Beesley's Chapel in Onslow county perhaps added fire to his reactions: "While I was preaching I observed several of the people go to a pail of water that stood near the door of the chapel to drink, which greatly disturbed the congregation, for which I gave them a public reproof, and called them to drink of the water of life."[27]

In North Carolina as elsewhere Pilmore preached at every opportunity, in a sincere attempt to foster the kind of spiritual rebirth which had already been experienced in England and in other parts of America. His general plan of operation was to gain permission (apparently with little difficulty) to use the courthouse in the small county towns scattered about the country, and to send a town crier or some co-operative citizen to invite all the inhabitants to his meetings. This he did in Currituck, Edenton, New Bern, and Wilmington.[28] If the local Anglican clergyman was at home, he sought his co-operation, though it seemed unlikely that even in the colonies the hospitality of a church pulpit would be offered to a lay itinerant preacher, however well-intentioned. In England the chapels of ease would similarly have been closed to him, but here

Pilmore seems to have preached in several, which furnishes a clue both to the lack of ordained clergy and to the spiritual hunger and independent spirit of the settlers. Positive identification of these preaching-places is often impossible; most have completely disappeared. It appears likely, however, that Pilmore preached in Anglican chapels at Coinjock and at Tulls Creek in Currituck county,[29] at the Narrows Chapel, probably also in Currituck, but possibly in Pasquotank,[30] at one near Hertford in Perquimans county,[31] and at Beesley's Chapel in Onslow county.[32] He even preached in St. Philip's Church in Brunswick, which at the time was without a minister, though there was one at St. James's, Wilmington.[33] And when at last he was homeward bound, in the ferryboat tacking against a contrary wind over Albemarle Sound to Edenton, two gentlemen pursued him in a canoe, pleading with him "to go back and preach in their parish churches on the Sunday."[34]

Clearly Joseph Pilmore found a welcome from churchmen throughout the coastal plain, especially from laymen, upon whose shoulders ecclesiastical leadership had fallen to a degree unparalleled in England. The traditional relationship between clergyman and lay vestry was increasingly being reversed, so that he was at their beck and call rather than vice versa, and in effect many vestries ran a congregationalist rather than an episcopal church.[35] This independent spirit in the parish, combined with the arduous itinerant labours expected of conscientious clergy and the lack of a bishop stationed in America, made it difficult to secure ordained replacements, and while the population multiplied the number of clergy dwindled. In 1762 there were seven, in 1764 six, in 1765 five, and although a superhuman effort on the part of Governor Tryon lifted the number to thirteen in 1767, by the time of Pilmore's visit in 1772 it had slipped to eleven.[36] This threw more and more responsibility upon educated laymen. Whitefield had noted that "in most places they have readers, who read a sermon every Sunday to the people."[37] Governor Tryon informed the S.P.G. that of such lay readers there were "two, three, or four, more or less, in each county."[38] The names of a few of these men have survived. The Earl of Granville's land agent, Francis Corbin, probably conducted the first Anglican services in Salisbury,[39] and a crown officer named William Hill read prayers in Brunswick Church when Josiah Quincy visited the area in 1773.[40] Lay readers furnished the most obvious source for native clergy, among whom were men like Peter Blinn, William Miller, and Charles Pettigrew,

the latter two being sent to England for authorization as late as 1775.[41]

Methodist preachers such as Pilmore, therefore, were accepted as lay readers in colonial chapels, and even churches, much more readily than they would have been in England. To some degree the Methodist preachers were even more acceptable, with their strong emphasis upon a spiritually renewed Church of England, their greater closeness to the common man, their everyday garb. Yet they acted with initiative, with courage, with authority, perhaps the more so because Mr. Wesley was not on hand to remind them that they were only laymen, after all, not ordained clergy. Except in administering the sacraments, however, they acted like true evangelical clergy, and undoubtedly came to feel like clergy. Certainly the normal pastoral itinerancy of the S.P.G. missionaries in whose steps they frequently followed did not seem strange or difficult to them—it was like a Methodist circuit back home.

When within a few months of Pilmore's visit other Methodist itinerants came over the Virginia border into the Piedmont, and even penetrated the mountains, they were often welcomed far more heartily than ordained Anglican clergy would have been. They clearly belonged on the pioneering trails, and at the same time filled a nostalgic longing for the Church of England, but that Church stripped of its pomp and power. A welcome even came from the dissenters flooding in from the British Isles, and from Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania. They might deliberately obstruct the efforts of the regular clergy, yet they readily became assimilated to the typical robust, evangelical frontier religion of almost any brand, but especially to the scaled down version of the Church of England offered by Methodism.[42] Some of the immigrants, of course, came from Methodist backgrounds, and to them Wesley's preachers were doubly welcome. In 1772-73, for instance, during his limited tours in North Carolina, Pilmore met Methodist acquaintances from London, New York, and Philadelphia.[43] Such Methodist immigrants brought with them the desire for Christian fellowship, and in some instances "were the means of raising up societies in the interior, while the preachers were labouring in the more Atlantic regions."[44]

Pilmore's visit probably bore little obvious fruit in the form of newly organized societies in North Carolina, though this is not certain. Rather its double effect was similar to Whitefield's tours—it kept alive the nostalgic desire for an evangelically reformed church with an English ethos, and it brought to spiritual awaken-

ing at least a few settlers and native Americans. The effective beginning of organized Methodism in North Carolina came through infiltration from Virginia of a revival led by an American priest of the Church of England improbably allied with an English Methodist lay itinerant preacher. Nor was this partnership important for North Carolina only. William Warren Sweet expressed it well when he spoke of the Virginia-North Carolina area as constituting "the cradle of American Methodism," though perhaps it would be more accurate to give this title to the larger southern region of Maryland-Virginia-North Carolina.[45] Here were combined in the middle 1770's a rapidly rising rate of immigration, a strong urge towards individualism and political independence of Britain, and a warm revivalistic type of religion which nevertheless through the upbringing and convictions of its leaders preserved strong strands of loyalty to the traditions of the Church of England embedded in Wesley's Methodism. In doctrine, in worship, in Christian fellowship, in social concern, even in church polity, the American Methodism which was to be reared in this cradle to serve the whole nation was moulded much more than ever it realized by British influences.

In all this the itinerant labours of the Rev. Devereux Jarratt (1733-1801), rector of Bath parish in Dinwiddie county, Virginia, were crucial, even though he did cool off when in 1784 it became quite apparent that the Methodists were going far beyond their initial purpose of reviving the Church of England from within.[46] Jarratt was already conducting a widespread and successful evangelical ministry within a radius of fifty miles of Bath when in March, 1773, there came to his house for a week (to use Jarratt's own words), "Mr. Robert Williams, . . . a plain, artless, indefatigable preacher of the gospel."[47] Williams had not been sent to America as one of Wesley's official missionaries, apparently because —and this seems strange in view of his relationship with Jarratt— he was so tactlessly critical of Anglican clergy in England. When he first came out at his own expense in 1769 he was little more than a local preacher, although he had served in a probationary capacity as an itinerant preacher in Ireland for two years. Pilmore remained somewhat suspicious of him as a free lance, and his name moved on and off the *Minutes* of the British Conference.[48] Of his general loyalty to Wesley's principles, however, there could be no doubt. Certainly he convinced Jarratt that the underlying purpose of Methodism was to revitalize the Church of England, so that Jarratt, himself cold-shouldered by most of the neighbouring clergy

in Virginia and North Carolina, with the one temporary exception of Archibald McRoberts,[49] wholeheartedly threw in his lot with the Methodists. Nor was there any doubt of the appeal to the settlers of Williams' sincerity and simple eloquence. Asbury paid him this tribute: "Perhaps no one in America has been an instrument of awakening so many souls as God has awakened by him."[50] As an evangelistic team Jarratt and Williams met with great success. Possibly in 1773, certainly by 1774, reinforced by other Methodist itinerants, they pushed south through the Virginia counties of Brunswick and what is now Greensville into the neighbouring counties in North Carolina.[51]

Within a month of his arrival in 1773 to take over from young Francis Asbury the reins of American Methodism, Thomas Rankin summoned the first American Conference, and the *Minutes* of these annual gatherings supply nationwide statistics of membership. Until that year the Baltimore area had constituted the Methodist stronghold, largely because of Robert Strawbridge's pioneering ventures, and his success in recruiting native preachers. The *Minutes* reveal both a steady acceleration in the growth of southern Methodism as a whole, and a rapid acceleration along what might be called the southern frontier. By the end of the Revolutionary War Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina contained six-sevenths of the nation's Methodists, and occupied the energies of two-thirds of the itinerant preachers.[52] Growth was especially rapid in North Carolina, and this was reflected in the increasing number of preachers stationed in the state, whose own efficacy in turn served to maintain the growth in membership. At its inception in 1776 the North Carolina circuit was credited with the third largest membership in the nation; by the following Conference it had overtaken Baltimore, and was second only to Brunswick in southern Virginia.

In August, 1775, Francis Asbury accepted an invitation to North Carolina, "to go and form a circuit in Currituck county, where they have very little preaching but what they pay for at the rate of three pounds per sermon." Asbury fell ill, however, so that he did not visit the state until 1780, though he retained a warm interest in its spiritual prosperity.[53] Asbury's senior at the time, both in years and in authority, was Thomas Rankin, the Scotsman whom Wesley had sent out to superintend all the work in America. Asbury had accepted the invitation to Currituck because this was a natural extension of his responsibilities as Assistant, or superintendent preacher, in charge of the Norfolk circuit. As General

Assistant Rankin was not restricted to any one circuit. Realizing the potential of North Carolina, in September, 1775, he wrote informing John Wesley that he planned to visit that colony. On October 20 Wesley replied: "I am glad you are going into North Carolina; and why not into South Carolina too? I apprehend those provinces would bear much fruit, as most parts of them are fresh, unbroken ground. And as the people are farther removed from the din of war, they may be more susceptible of the gospel of peace."[54]

Like Asbury, however, Rankin also was forced to defer his visit, though in his case only for a few months. In the meantime his close friend George Shadford was meeting with great success in Brunswick Circuit, with which Devereux Jarratt's societies were officially linked in the spring of 1776.[55] The natural extension of this work was over the state border into the counties of Halifax and Bute[56]—which in 1779 was divided between Warren and Franklin counties. When the preachers assembled for their Conference in Baltimore, beginning May 21, 1776, Rankin wrote, "None gave me greater pleasure to see than my worthy friend and fellow laborer, Brother Shadford."[57] Rankin thus summarized the reports given: "If we had reason to mourn over the decrease of the work in the northern circuits, we had abundant cause to bless the Lord for the great increase in Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. We had added to our number upwards of two thousand members this last year, and the preachers increased also."[58] The elevation of North Carolina into an independent circuit during that conference seems to have been little more than a formality agreed upon in advance—one with which the distant Mr. Wesley would surely have agreed, as would Asbury, also absent, through illness. Not only was the new circuit credited with 683 members; it was staffed by a full complement of three preachers, as many as any other circuit, while New York (with 132 members) and Philadelphia (with 137) were still served by only one preacher each.[59]

Immediately after the conference Rankin went north to a round of duties in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, though all the time, he stated, "I endeavoured to dispatch my business as fast as I could in order to set off for Virginia and Carolina."[60] In Virginia the revival was gathering momentum. Rankin collected a number of testimonies and personal letters which on his return to England in 1778 he sent with a covering letter to John Wesley, who published them as a thirty-six-page pamphlet, *A Brief Narrative of the Revival of Religion in Virginia;* this went through four editions in two years, and another in 1786. Eventually he managed to spend a few

hot but rewarding July days in North Carolina. He reported to Wesley: "Monday, [July] 15, I rode toward North Carolina. In every place the congregations were large, and received the word with all readiness of mind. I know not that I have spent such a week since I came to America." On Sunday, July 21, he said, "I preached at Roanoke Chapel to more than double of what the house would contain. In general the white people were within the chapel, and the black people without. The windows being all open everyone could hear, and hundreds felt the word of God. Many were bathed in tears, and others rejoicing with joy unspeakable."[61] On Tuesday, July 23, he crossed over to the south side of the Roanoke River, "and rode to the church of a friendly clergyman who gives the use of that and another church to our preachers and people. Many attended the word, and I was enabled to speak with freedom. The Lord crowned with his blessing our assembling together, and his powerful presence was peculiarly felt in meeting the members of the different societies, some of which had come from far."[62] Thus Thomas Rankin was able to return north, and (after two war-harassed years) to England, with a genuine personal enthusiasm for this promising extension of Virginia Methodism into North Carolina. Nor was Asbury less enthusiastic when later he took over its direction. Both were ably seconded by a significant sprinkling of British immigrants as well as by native Americans.

It is important to notice how during the formative colonial and revolutionary years British-born preachers continued to gravitate both to the south and to positions of leadership. Of the ten preachers stationed in 1773 only one was born in America, William Watters.[63] Of the nineteen in 1774 three were itinerants sent over from England by Wesley: Francis Asbury, Thomas Rankin, and George Shadford; eight were British immigrants who had come out on their own: Edward Dromgoole,[64] John King,[65] Robert Lindsay,[66] Daniel Ruff,[67] Thomas Webb,[68] Abraham Whitworth,[69] Robert Williams, and Joseph Yearbry;[70] eight appear to have been born in America: William Duke, Philip Ebert, Philip Gatch, Isaac Rollins, John Wade, William Watters, and Richard Webster. The position was not much changed in 1775, though an interesting phenomenon may be observed: all five preachers assigned to Virginia (out of a total of twenty for the nation) were of British origin. To a lesser degree the same thing continued throughout the Revolution. The British itinerant preachers sent over by Wesley for the most part returned home, as did a few of the volunteer missionaries. A solid nucleus of preachers with a British back-

ground, however, was left to strengthen the work during the perilous years when an appreciation of the British heritage might so easily be interpreted as treachery to the cause of political independence. At the head of this stabilizing force was Francis Asbury, whose example and statecraft were to earn him election as bishop at the close of the war. This little suspected British influence can be seen in the stationing of the preachers in the proliferating circuits in North Carolina.

When the first North Carolina Circuit was formed in 1776 the Assistant was the Irish native, Edward Dromgoole, with two American-born preachers, Isham Tatum and Frank Poythress (one of Jarratt's converts) as colleagues under his oversight. In 1777 the Assistant in charge was again a British native, John King, supported by another, John Dickins,[71] and two Americans. By 1778 Asbury was the only one of Wesley's itinerants left on the American stations, but several British natives supported him in his change of national allegiance: Edward Dromgoole, now Assistant of the Sussex Circuit, and John Dickins, now Assistant of the Brunswick Circuit, both in Virginia. The North Carolina Circuit had now been subdivided into three, with William Glendenning, a British native,[72] in charge of Roanoke, Leroy Cole, a Virginian, in charge of Tar River, and James O'Kelly, surely of Irish background,[73] in charge of New Hope.

Undoubtedly it was the message and personality of the Methodist preachers which won the settlers' allegiance, but their British background proved no serious obstacle when allied to demonstrable American patriotism. Indeed it achieved some important side effects. Nationally, especially through the strong advocacy of Francis Asbury, it delayed the declaration of ecclesiastical independence until 1784, and at that time ensured an episcopal church organized largely as a combination of the British Methodist Society and the Church of England rather than one with a frankly presbyterian or congregationalist polity. In the state of North Carolina it seems to have preserved Methodist links with the widely discredited Anglicans, taking over much of their missionary work, and succeeding to many of their church buildings.

Throughout the Revolutionary War Asbury continued to seek close co-operation with the Anglican clergy, himself worshipped in Anglican churches, and urged the mutual sharing of services, eventually seeing this as a valid reason why (in Virginia at least) "the Methodists are most likely to have permanent success, because the inhabitants are generally Episcopalians."[74] The first native

itinerant, William Watters, entered into this same spirit, maintaining, "We considered ourselves at this time [1777] as belonging to the Church of England," and expressing amazement how in spite of this and the many hazards of war the work made such rapid progress.[75] Not all the preachers agreed, of course, and a division into northern episcopal Methodism and southern presbyterian Methodism was narrowly averted when in 1779 a group of young American-born southerners formed a presbytery and ordained each other.[76] Asbury continued to maintain his allegiance to the Church of England in spite of opposition from some of his colleagues, however, and persuaded them at least to defer any radical change until the end of the war.[77] It seems that the eager desire for the Lord's Supper, which fed the urge to secure an ordained ministry of their own, was especially strong among those Methodists who had their roots in the Church of England, and a few weeks after the formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church Asbury remarked, "Nothing could have better pleased our old Church folks than the late step we have taken in administering the ordinances."[78] Apparently even a breach with the Church of England hierarchy was not too high a price to pay in order to secure the regular administration of the sacraments. Yet even then the Anglican ties were not completely severed.

The Church of England in North Carolina, as elsewhere, tended to be the prerogative of the aristocracy, the stronghold of Toryism. As such it was a natural target for lower middle class envy and patriotic pressure.[79] Wesley's preachers were almost always lower in the social scale than the Anglican clergy, for the most part being self-educated men, though making up in evangelistic zeal and warm pastoral concern what they might lack in formal learning. The British preachers greatly admired one clergyman, however, John Wesley, and he became their ideal of a Church of England missionary, whom most of them wished to emulate. An integral element in his character was an undying resolve to remain a member and minister within the Church of England, and he never ceased to urge his followers to similar loyalty. This too, therefore, his followers learned from him, though with varying degrees of enthusiasm. In a sense it was easier for them to be thus loyal in North Carolina than in England, for here the Church was less entrenched, and here its patterns of activity were markedly similar to those of the Methodist societies in England, with the missionary traveling round a circuit of preaching-places, and employing laymen as helpers just as Wesley did. Undoubtedly a few came to see themselves

as helping to bring about an American renewal of the Church of England.

The departure for England of the more aristocratic and Tory of the clergy, together with the wealthiest of the laity, made this still more possible. The huge exodus during the war left the Church tottering. Not only almost all the clergy subsidized by the S.P.G. went, but many of those in self-supporting parishes. Only a tiny fraction remained.[80] Actually North Carolina seems to have fared better than most states. George Micklejohn, although he left St. Matthew's Church, Hillsborough, remained in the area.[81] Nathaniel Blount continued to minister in his native Beaufort county.[82] Charles Pettigrew served intermittently as Rector of St. Paul's, Edenton, after his resignation in 1784, and eventually became the first bishop-elect of North Carolina.[83] He was especially co-operative with the Methodists, even attending their Quarterly Meetings, as did Devereux Jarratt in Virginia.[84] Leonard Cutting, who came to New Bern in 1785, was also friendly to the Methodists.[85] An ecumenical movement in himself was Robert Johnston Miller, an immigrant Scot who became a Methodist preacher in Virginia, attended the first Methodist Annual Conference held in North Carolina (1785), traveled with Dr. Thomas Coke and discussed with him Coke's plans to bring Methodism solidly into the fold of the Protestant Episcopal Church, then located in Lincoln county, accepting Lutheran ordination in 1794 in order the better to serve his flock as a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church.[86]

As their clergy either left the continent or prudently became less highly visible the sturdy middle class patriot laymen gained even more power, and most of them were ready wholeheartedly to embrace the emphasis upon freedom of conscience which had been one of the pillars of the colony's first charter.[87] They welcomed the proliferating Methodists to their churches, and the Methodist preachers to their pulpits. It seems almost certain that a welcome was also available for other mainstream dissenting denominations, but one which was less cordial and less frequently accepted. It was a fairly natural process that the Anglican and Methodist groups should coalesce and continue to use the Anglican building. Indeed from the beginning the groups seem to have overlapped.

No census seems to have been attempted of these colonial Anglican churches, but the piecing together of clues from the printed *Colonial Records,* from local and county histories, and other sources, has resulted in a list of at least sixty buildings, in addition to many more preaching points, usually in people's

homes.[88] Some of the Anglican congregations continued to occupy their own buildings, even in two or three instances (as we have seen) served by their former clergy.[89] In 1790 there were the feeble beginnings of Episcopal consolidation by the summoning of the first North Carolina Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, prompted by Bishop William White.[90] Sometimes the church was destroyed or fell into ruin, like St. Matthew's at Hillsborough.[91] Frequently it became a community building, available for public gatherings of various types, including religious services by different denominations, like St. John's in Williamsboro, Vance County,[92] the old wooden church at Halifax, in Halifax County,[93] and the rebuilt church at Hillsborough.[94] Many of them, however, especially in the north and east, seem to have become more closely associated with the Methodists than with any other group: Moyock, Coinjock and the Narrows Chapels in Currituck;[95] Fork Chapel in Camden county, rebuilt jointly by the Episcopalians and the Methodists in 1792;[96] possibly Newbegun Church in Pasquotank;[97] St. John's Chapel in Hertford, Perquimans;[98] Costen's Chapel and Knotty Pine Chapel in Gates;[99] four, possibly more, in Halifax county—Conoconara, Whitaker's Chapel, Eden (Beaverdam Swamp), and Cypress Chapel;[100] Banks Chapel, in Wilton, Granville County;[101] Lee's Chapel in Caswell County;[102] St. Thomas's Church, Merryhill, and Bridge Creek Chapel, in Bertie;[103] St. John's Church, Beaufort, Straits Chapel, and Bell's Chapel, in Carteret County;[104] and Waccamaw Chapel, in Columbus County.[105] More extensive research might well modify some of these details, and almost certainly bring more examples to light. It is likely, however, that the general picture will remain the same.

These findings seem sufficiently documented already to necessitate a revision of the traditional view of the post-Revolution Anglican fortunes. Joseph Blount Cheshire wrote: "In Edenton, Newbern, and Wilmington, the Church people held together. . . . At the other extremity of the state Parson Miller gathered together the handful of Churchmen of Lincoln and Rowan counties . . . from 1785 until the happy revival under Bishop Ravenscroft. . . . But in all the intervening country the Church went utterly to decay."[106] Perhaps it would be fairer to say that the colonial Church of England was in some measure at least fused with the Methodist Episcopal Church, its religious witness renewed and rechanneled rather than suffering from complete disintegration. Certainly Methodism in North Carolina remained the most English-oriented Church, nor were its relations with the Protestant

Episcopal Church marred by the bitter antagonisms which developed between Methodism and the Church of England in Britain during the nineteenth century. In many areas there was effective co-operation, and in the state as a whole the one Episcopal Church supplemented the other, the Episcopalians being strongest in their original territory, the eastern seaboard, while the Methodists spread themselves were widely, but were more notably stronger in the west.[107]

John Wesley's dream of a Church of England renewed by means of his Methodist Societies did not come true in his native land. In America, however, there was no fear of the exuberant new Methodist Episcopal Church being overpowered or ignored by the parent body—the Revolution had almost reversed their traditional English roles. Yet this episcopal daughter had entered into the heritage of her Anglican mother as well as that of her Methodist father, so that John Wesley's vision was almost realized in America, and especially in North Carolina.

CHAPTER TWO

A Lesson from Methodist History

Reflections on How Methodism Survived Transplantation to the New World and Lived to Prosper in America

STUART C. HENRY

When Methodists first appeared in England they were accounted a sorry lot, indeed, and adjudged unacceptable on grounds as diverse as ridiculous life style and subversive character. Orthodox churchmen were inclined to regard them as irreverent and heretical. Sophisticates thought them silly or mad. Common folk considered them never less than odd; but high and low rejected them, and, whether from suspicion born of prejudice, or cruelty born of ignorance, abused and persecuted them. Alarmed at the danger with which this "new dispensation" threatened society, an Anglican bishop denounced the Methodists as a "Composition of Enthusiasm, Superstition, and Imposture," and proceeded to explain his objection:

> When the blood and spirits run high inflaming the brain and imagination; it is most properly Enthusiasm; which is Religion run mad:—when low and dejected, causing groundless terrors, or placing the great duty of man in little observances; 'tis Superstition, which is religion scared out of its senses.[1]

But worst of all, "when any fraudulent dealings are made use of, and any wrong projects carried on under the mask of piety; 'tis Imposture, and may [be] turmed Hypocrite."[2] The acerbic Horace Walpole labeled the sect fiendish,[3] and an urbane Henry Fielding

Stuart C. Henry, Ph.D., is Professor of American Christianity at the Divinity School of Duke University.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 146.

branded their principles "pernicious."[4] Samuel Foote, Oxonian, perceiving that well-aimed railery can kill the cause which martyrdom only dignifies, produced a farce which "opened the eyes" of the populace, to the "absurdities of that set of enthusiasts" more "than all the . . . serious writings . . . published against them."[5]

Such libel was little different from that with which Rome served early Christians, and doubtless for many of the same reasons; for the early Christians, as the Methodists, comprised a sect, and as a sect were judged a queer and suspect lot: flagrantly unpatriotic, they refused to bear arms, even under duress; nor would they sacrifice to the emperor. Much as the Methodists at a later day (less dramatic, but equally adamant), eschewed Balls and Assemblies, early Christians refused to attend the games or participate in any holiday celebration. Precisely so did the early Methodists desert and condemn a society which they disapproved. Quite as bold as first century Christians, the Methodists, too, often appeared froward and obstreperous as they swarmed through the streets of London and over the countryside on their errands of mission and mercy.

The establishment objected—a characteristic reaction. The subsequent history is almost a cliché in the record of sects: A dissenting body, small and nameless at first appearance, may live unnoticed; but grown large and even prosperous, it threatens the establishment, which in turn, endeavoring to maintain entrenched privilege by extorting conformity, persecutes the dissidents. The sect which refuses to compromise may well perish. But if the sect makes a truce with the world, sloughs off its more outré characteristics and purchases security with sacrificed distinction, if not integrity, it may live.

Such was the pattern of early Christianity, and such was the survival pattern of Methodism. At first despised and soon persecuted, even to the death, the Christians in time discovered a measure of sanctuary in the sponsorship of government. After Constantine proclaimed himself sole emperor, it came about that a cult of Those Who Wait, whose faith was born among a community of peasant fisher folk, forsook their underground hiding and climbed onto the chariot of a tavern keeper's grandson, and with him arrived at an imperial throne.

After the same manner, if less dramatically, respectability overtook the Methodists. "The violence and cruelty,—the insolence and calumny, and flagrant injustice,—to which [Wesley] and his companions were daily and hourly subjected," Trevelyn reminds us,

"must be reckoned as the full equivalent of many martyrdoms."[6] So much is true, for the magistrate who gave rioters at Otley permission to do what they would to Methodists, so long as they broke no bones, and the Earl who turned out an honest domestic after fifty years of service, for no other fault than attending a Methodist gathering, were by no means exceptions. Not many years after the time of such distressing outrages, however, George Whitefield, who was, at least by the populace, accepted as appropriate spokesman for the Methodists, admitted wistfully that the days of persecution were past, and with them a distinctive religious character. "O London! London!" he wept, "there are few [left] that like to go out into the fields [to preach]; broken heads and dead cats are no more the ornaments of a Methodist," who are now adorned in "silk scarves."[7]

Recognition of the similarity in the fortunes of early Christians and first generation Methodists is not condemnation of either. The respectable prosperity which Methodists achieved simply illustrates the axiom already stated, namely, that the sect that survives must—in some measure—acculturate. Rigid asceticism courts early death, self-engendered; and inflexible adherence to patterns of behavior which the community regards as strange only delays the inevitable death of that essence which brought the cult into life, and occasions social ostracism in the interim.

The story of religion in America documents the thesis. Flourishing communities of Shakers died out through a steadfast unwillingness to conform to the world. In the decade before the Civil War, the society reached its zenith, with some six thousand members in its eighteen branches.[8] Today only a few Shakers remain alive. They are old, and weary, and their destiny is in the past. Their charming homes have become museums, and their doctrines the data of research. Yet the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints have survived persecution and ridicule, and turned the salt flats of Utah into a blossoming meadow. There is, however, more to the story than that. No longer reviled as advocates of plural marriage, nor spurned as dupes of romantic tales of briefly seen golden plates written in reformed Egyptian hieroglyphics, they are respected as loyal citizens of unquestioned integrity and prodigious industry, as indeed they are, because they have made ethical behavior a significant focus in their lives.

North Carolina Methodism in the days of the colonies and the subsequent period of the young republic may be uniquely Ameri-

can, but it is not uniquely Carolinian. Rather that history affords illustration of the axiom already stated. Sensitive to the social environment and emerging political phenomena, Methodism instinctively took the form best suited to nourish the young movement, and responded unerringly to the rising disposition of democracy. In Carolina, as elsewhere along the Atlantic seaboard, a group of dissenters, unwelcome, even suspect, made the transformation from sect to church, able, in part, to accomplish the metamorphosis through adaptation to a secular community. Let us begin at the beginning.

One of the early Methodist visitors to North Carolina was Robert Williams, an impetuous preacher and a vigorous critic of the American clergy. Williams had secured permission to come as an itinerant to America, only on condition that he promise to work under the supervision of others, for Wesley did not feel that the man had a teachable spirit. The young missionary sold his horse and saddle bags to pay his debts, booked passage through the generosity of a friend, and arrived in America in the autumn of 1769. Having begun his work in New York City he had, by 1774, worked his way toward Virginia, where he organized the Brunswick circuit, which extended from Petersburg "to the south over the Roanoke River, some distance into North Carolina."[9] Although Methodism was not a particularly good name in the colonies, Southern people found him appealing. Devereux Jarratt, the evangelical Anglican priest of the parish of Bath, pronounced Williams, who was the first Methodist preacher he "ever conversed with or saw" a "plain, simple-hearted, pious man."[10] Jarratt, of course, was already a friend of the awakeners in the colonies, and sympathetic to their doctrine and their style, so much so that even when he had gone to England some years earlier to take Holy Orders, those who heard him preach "strongly suspected" that he "was a *Methodist,* or something else besides a churchman."[11] Jarratt found Williams an especially attractive individual and received him cordially.

Doubtless Jarratt and people were both, in a measure, taken by the preaching of Williams, because—in addition to his proclamation of the Gospel—he "was greatly blessed in detecting the hypocrite, razing false foundations, and stirring believers up,"[12] especially when the culprits were found in the establishment. The egalitarian spirit was already recognizable among Methodists in England, who had preached in the fields, and sought out and ministered to miners in areas where townsfolk had "bolted their doors

and barricaded their windows"[13] when colliers came about. A similar concern ignited missionaries who fought their way through the dense forests and the tangled underbrush of the Dismal Swamp to bring the good news to the colonists of North Carolina. Moreover, these itinerants who were so undaunted by circumstance as they made their rounds that it became proverbial to say that even in the worst of weather the crows and the Methodist circuit riders would be out, not only sought the lost sheep in the most remote locations; they met with their flocks in metaphor and attitude, speaking their language and addressing themselves to their problems. Just such an apostle was Robert Williams; although there were times when he seemed, if possible, too idiomatic in his preaching, "The general conclusion," reported Jesse Lee, "was that they never heard such a man before:" for they said, "Sometimes he would preach, then he would pray, then he would swear, and at times he could cry." The fact is that some were unaccustomed to hear a minister use the words *hell,* or *Devil* in his sermons, and they thought Williams was "swearing when he told them about going to hell, or being damned if they died in their sins."[14] But such initial reaction was soon displaced with hearty endorsement when they understood the stature of the man; then they were "glad to get him to their houses."[15] Frequently when he went to hear one of the established clergy preach he would, when the service was over, go out of the church, and, "standing on a stump, block, or log," begin to "sing, pray, and then preach to hundreds of people."[16] Thus he "bore the Cross into North Carolina,"[17] where he "proved the goodness of his doctrine, by his tears in public, and his life and conduct in private."[18] He became one of them.

A Methodist contemporary of Robert Williams, and even earlier than he to visit North Carolina, was Joseph Pilmore. At the Conference at Leeds in 1769 John Wesley had laid before the brethren the plight of the American colonists as only he could do, telling how they were "in great want of money, but much more of preachers."[19] When he asked, "Who is willing to go?" then and there two laymen responded to the Macedonian urgency, one of whom was Pilmore.[20] That was in August, and before the month was out Pilmore had taken passage on the "Mary and Elizabeth," happy to be bound for the New World, because he had for some time been "under great exercise of mind respecting the dear Americans."[21] After a passage of nine weeks from London, he landed at Gloucester Point, six miles below Philadelphia, on the nineteenth day of October.[22] Three years passed before Pilmore arrived in North

Carolina, but meanwhile he commended himself to Americans by his preaching, and the transparent warmth which he felt for them. Characteristically he had preached one of his first sermons from an improvised pulpit at a race track. Instinctively his audiences responded to his open and honest affection; and the young missionary wrote Wesley how the people "flock[ed] in multitudes" and how "between four and five thousand hearers" stood "with attention, still as night."[23]

The journey to North Carolina was arduous, a succession of frustrations and necessity—sleepless nights in damp beds, rain-drenched passage on leaky ferries, raw winter weather, little provision for men and none for horses in a wilderness where an ordinary or an inn was hardly to be found.[24] Pilmore was in a country two hundred miles wide, without a single minister, and when he found a church it might just as well be "a poor damp dirty place" as a "pretty little structure."[25] Nevertheless, Pilmore's indomitable spirit, born beyond all cavil of a true and lively faith, sustained him. When he became ill he "took a little Turlington's Balsam,"[26] and he began the year 1773 with "high praises of the Lord and King. . . . [and] thankfulness for his wondrous goodness."[27]

Plainly the people of North Carolina, as Americans generally, responded to Pilmore first of all because he came preaching good tidings. It is also quite possible that either from instinct or observation, they were drawn to him because of his genuinely independent spirit—a sentiment which was steadily stronger during the days when Pilmore itinerated in the south. Whether Carolinians marked his free spirit, however, may be in dispute; but there is no question that he was a liberated individual, free without being obnoxious, and forthright without being offensive. That character of the man is a matter of tradition and record.

Pilmore seems not to have suffered too gladly the supervision of his affairs by others. Wesley's attitude toward his lay preachers was a paternalistic one, a circumstance as understandable as it was obvious. Acknowledgment of the strength of the patriarchal nature of Wesley's relationship to the movement is plain in the continuing reference to the founder as "Mr." Wesley, a title, of course, originally indicative of conventional acceptance of the English definition of the status of gentleman, and yet persistently maintained by many who, if they do not understand the implication of the usage, are quite comfortable in its employ. It was to John King, a Methodist

preacher in the colonies who, in 1777, was assigned to the North Carolina circuit,[28] that Wesley wrote: "Scream no more, at the peril of your soul . . . . Speak as earnestly as you can; but do not scream. Speak with all your heart; but with a moderate voice." Lest the brother misunderstand, Wesley said explicitly, "God now warns you by me, whom he has set over you."[29] Exactly this assumption Pilmore rejected, even when he could not deny the fact. Toward the end of his Carolina tour Pilmore confided to his *Journal* that Mr. Wesley, "who should have been a compassionate father to us, has treated us in a manner, not to be mentioned."[30] Nor was Wesley the only one whose attitude Pilmore condemned. Francis Asbury admitted that on the matter of the itinerancy, often a delicate subject, he "received a letter from Mr. Pilmore which surpassed everything he ever met with from a Methodist preacher." "The Lord judge between him and me!" he added.[31] Later Asbury confessed that the man seemed "blind to his own conduct."[32] And as late as July 4, 1794, long after Pilmore had left the Methodists, he sat with Asbury at dinner when Asbury's executive habits were discussed in such a manner that Asbury felt it necessary to defend himself, saying that he "did not make the rules, but had to execute them."[33] It was a situation, the bishop continued, in which the choice was often the bad one of sustaining insult for himself or for the conference. "I hardly knew sometimes where to set my foot," he said.[34]

The scraps and pieces of available data do not give a complete, or even clear picture of the difficulty—if there was a difficulty—between Pilmore and his Methodist superiors. Shortly after Pilmore returned from his southern tour the first American Conference of traveling Methodist preachers was held in Philadelphia, under the direction of Thomas Rankin, lately arrived from England, and acting as Wesley's representative.[35] Pilmore was restrained during the meeting; and when the assignments were read there was none for him. In less than six months Pilmore "embarked at New York for England."[36] Yet, a straw will indicate the direction of the wind, and there can be no lack of certainty that Pilmore was tender of his rights and jealous of the innate human dignity implied in personal liberty. When he was agrieved with Wesley it seems to have been at the point of acceptance—the co-implicate of personal liberty: "We have not had from Wesley," he once confessed

> so much as one single letter that we could read to the people, nothing but jealous reflections, unkind suspicions, and sharp reproofs came from under his hand, which greatly discouraged us in the work, and would certainly have driven us away, if we had not regarded the work of the Lord above

> everything this World can possibly give. . . . I was amazed that Mr. Wesley should treat me as if I had been the foulest offender and an enemy to God and Mankind!![37]

The point here is not whether these words intend what they seem to, or even, if Pilmore's dudgeon (if it be this) is defensible. The significant focus for this reflection is the spirit of the man who enjoyed the freedom to express himself as he did. Folk who believed the ground to be level at the foot of the cross, as the Methodists did, and who found there God's free grace, were ill-disposed to curtail the free expression of themselves in matters political or social.

When the Revolution came, Methodists found themselves in a predicament. Suspect religiously for their dissenting creed and practice in matters of the faith, they were in addition often held doubtful patriots, because they were, understandably, associated with the Anglican body which was plainly an extension of the crown. Moreover, they were served by many English preachers who had but lately arrived, and whose Tory sentiment was public knowledge. Establishment in New England was the prerogative of the Congregational Church, and it was the custom of ministers there on election day to "walk in procession, smoke pipes, and drink. . . . they would talk over who should be governor, and who lieutenant governor, . . . and their counsels would prevail."[38] But in Virginia and the Carolinas where Anglicanism was established, patriotism of the communicants was not taken for granted. Asbury reported that "it was the general language of the American people and preachers that those preachers from Europe who were dissatisfied with the measure of the country, had better go home."[39] Eventually all of the English preachers—save Asbury—did return to England, and he was virtually in retirement until the peace had come. The problem, however, had remained; for it was the problem of the people more than of their ministers. Before the war was over "American Methodists were almost universally considered as Tories."[40]

Some of the fault lies with John Wesley, whose attitude changed curiously between the time when English-American relations began to deteriorate, and the moment when the first shots were fired at Lexington. "I do not defend the measures which have been taken with regard to America," wrote Wesley in 1768, "I doubt whether any man can defend them, either on foot of law, equity, or prudence."[41] Although in March 1775, Wesley charged the English

preacher Thomas Rankin that he should "say not a word against one or the other side,"[42] he did not follow that good advice himself. Subsequently he wrote frankly to his brother Charles: "I find a danger now of a new kind: A danger of losing my love for the Americans: I mean for their miserable leaders. . . ."[43] Meanwhile he had produced *A Calm Address to Our American Colonies,* after which there was neither doubt nor privacy concerning the staunch Toryism of the Methodist leader.

Having read Samuel Johnson's *Taxation No Tyranny,* Wesley was profoundly impressed and came to "a different judgment on this head" of the American colonies, and "judged it his duty to impart it to others."[44] He besought Americans: "Come to yourselves,"[45] and tactlessly, if not ignorantly, cautioned them of the danger of excitement over grievances "which either never existed, or are aggravated above measure."[46] The root of the matter, he said, was neither politics nor taxes, for colonial difficulties were the kind that "never will or can be thoroughly removed, till we fear God and honour the King!"[47] Indeed, Wesley continued, the Americans were fortunate: "You have therefore exactly what your ancestors left you; not a vote in making laws, nor in choosing legislators; but the happiness of being protected by laws, and the duty of obeying them."[48] The pamphlet was an immediate sensation: Many in England were charmed. Many in America were outraged. One critic responded with *A Cool Reply to a Calm Address,* and another attacked Wesley with the publication of *A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing; or an Old Jesuit Unmasked.*[49] Wesley himself was objective about the war. While he advised colonists to remain calm, he pointed out to the English that it was unrealistic to imagine that Americans could be defeated by mercenaries who "fight for pay, none of whom care a straw for the cause wherein they are engaged; most of whom strongly disapprove of it."[50] The Americans, he said, "will not be frightened."[51] And he pled with Lord North, the prime minister, "O my lord, if your lordship can do anything, let it not be wanting! For God's sake, for the sake of the King, of the nation . . . remember Rehoboam! Remember Philip the Second! Remember King Charles the First!"[52]

Wesley's earnest pleas went unheeded. Francis Asbury lamented that he was "truly sorry that the venerable man ever dipped into politics of America." But excited patriots did not wait to examine the niceties of circumstance surrounding Wesley's pronouncements. Methodists were stigmatized with the accusation of disloyalty, and they were persecuted as subversives—sometimes bitterly: Freeborn

Garretson was set upon by a howling mob, who beat him, crying, "He is a Tory! . . . Hang him, hang him!"[53] Jesse Lee fared better, although he was for a while imprisoned for refusal to bear arms.[54]

Yet for the most part Methodists were loyal to America, and conventionally so. What Wesley had correctly sensed about the spirit of the patriots was increasingly characteristic of the Methodists as Methodists. And ironically, while their countrymen questioned their patriotism, they were themselves the object of continuing criticism from Wesley, who openly professed his Tory bias. He referred to the "brawlers for liberty," pointing out that their overtures were voiced in a society where there was the "vilest of slavery."[55] Inquiring if any would blaspheme God or King (a reference in no way criptic in 1776) he disavowed any tolerance for fellowship with those who would, saying that he would no more associate with them than with "whoremongers, or sabbath-breakers, or thieves, or drunkards, or common swearers."[56] The Americans, said Wesley, drove "women and children into the wild woods, in the depth of winter." How could one then speak of "American virtue?" Are these the men, he asked, who are "proposed as a pattern to all Europe."[57]

From contemporary perspective it is clear that increasingly the pressures upon Methodism indicated the necessity of validation of identity—without reference to Wesley and without reference to England. Neither able nor eager to forget their origins, Methodists experienced the urgency to break out of the chrysalis of sect and come of age as church. There is a parable in Asbury's self description after the last of the English preachers had returned and only he was left. Depressed and under "heaviness of mind," he acknowledged that "it was no wonder: three thousand miles from home—my friends have left me—I am considered by some as an enemy of the country—every day liable to be seized by violence and abused."[58] So much might have been said of many Methodists. The way along which solution lay is indicated in the wisdom with which Asbury resolved his own difficulty.

On receiving the news that peace had come at last Asbury reflected: ". . . our preachers will be far more likely to settle in the world; and our people, by getting into trade, and acquiring wealth, may drink into its spirit."[59] New exposure to the world, and limited experience in self government which the haphazard administration of war years necessitated had planted seeds in Methodism which were germinating into a vigorous spirit, new but not unrelated to the vitality already there. North Carolina Method-

ists had united with their Virginia brethren in the unsupervised days of the war to ordain themselves that they might celebrate the sacraments: "There was great cause to fear a division, and both parties trembled for the Ark of God. . . ."[60] Time and patience were required for Asbury to reconcile people and preachers to returning to the former ways they had followed; and even then the truce was recognized as but "for a season."[61] Asbury's innate good sense and perception of the flowering spirit of American Methodism is plain in his behavior at the Christmas Conference, the gathering in Baltimore in 1784 when the Methodists worked out the first independent and national organization of a religious communion in free America. "Mr. *Asbury* was appointed a *superintendent* by Mr. *Wesley,* yet he would not submit to be ordained, unless he could be voted in by the conference." As it happened, Mr. Asbury was "unanimously chosen,"[62] but it was the choice of the conference, not the selection of Wesley.

No longer feeling themselves bound to the mother Church of England, the Methodists had already united with dissenting Baptists in espousing disestablishment in Virginia, and now they were insistent upon autonomy.[63] Only Asbury remained of the English preachers who had led them in the early years. The young and native-born who had come into prominence rejected old ways and shaped their speech and their practice to new conditions. Yet it is a mistake to conclude that Methodists were undisciplined dissenters. The history of their stunning growth and remarkable achievements is the chronicle of a sect that accommodated to an environment sufficiently to survive without sacrificing the essence of the primitive faith. The episode of James O'Kelly is apposite.

The Rev'd. James O'Kelly was an ardent and industrious Methodist preacher whose Irish heart was zealous for righteousness, quick in sympathy, and indignant over injustice. In 1778 he had come to North Carolina. Willful and fiery, he was also "an advocate for holiness, given to prayer and fasting."[64] None equalled his zeal in preaching, or his effectiveness as a witness. William McKendree has left a glowing testimony of the evangel. "B. O'K preached shorely the greatest sermon that ever I heard—we had a good time the D. old man got all his bitter cups sweetened & his soul inflamed, Bless the Lord for such times as this."[65] Again: "B. O'K preached and preaching it was. O! how happy my soul was. He reasoned the sinners quite out of themselves. Very few of the sinners eyes but what leaked."[66] There was, indeed, a time at which the souls of O'Kelly and Asbury were knit together.

Asbury recalled the occasion when he and O'Kelly had been in a situation where there was much apathy among the people, and Asbury, as a consequence, had not enjoyed "much liberty." But O'Kelly, said Asbury, "raised high and was very affecting, but to little purpose." Asbury's account indicates a warm regard for his companion:

> There are evils here; the meeting not solemn; the women appeared to be full of dress, the men full of news. These people are gospels slighters. I fear some heavy stroke will come on them. James O'Kelly and myself enjoyed and comforted each other: this dear man rose at midnight, and prayed very devoutly for me and himself. He cried, give me children or I die; but I believe no preaching or preacher will do much good at present.[67]

Nevertheless O'Kelly continued to speak up for truth and lash out at injustice and discrimination wherever he found them. When he and Asbury visited in Brunswick County, Virginia, in 1785, they

> found the minds of the people greatly agitated with our rules against slavery, and a proposed petition to the general assembly for the emancipation of the blacks. Colonel Bedford and Doctor Coke disputed on the subject, and the Colonel used some threats: next day brother O'Kelly let fly at them, and they were made angry enough; we, however, came off with whole bones, and our business in conference was finished in peace.[68]

In due course, though, O'Kelly's spirit of resistance to abrogation of liberty was directed toward Asbury himself. On Tuesday, January 12, 1790, Asbury wrote in his *Journal*: "I received a letter from the presiding elder of this district, James O'Kelly; he makes heavy complaints of my power, and he bids me stop for one year, or he must use his influence against me. . . ."[69]

Inevitably O'Kelly's asserted independence clashed with Asbury's supervision. When Asbury had received the suggestion of a year off, he had been "greatly alarmed;"[70] and presently he discovered just how alarming O'Kelly could be. At the Baltimore Conference in November 1792, O'Kelly and others, disaffected with the arbitrary procedure for appointing ministers to circuits without opportunity for redress in case of dissatisfaction, endeavored, vainly, to change the matter, and, when they could not, bolted from the conference. Jesse Lee recorded the episode charitably, and a little sadly: A few preachers were appointed to coax the dissidents

> to resume their seats. . . . But all their persuasions were of little weight; for they would not come . . . . waiting in town a day or two longer, O'Kelly and the preachers that were particularly influenced by him, set off for Virginia, taking their saddle-bags, great coats, and other bundles on their shoulders or arms, walking on foot to the place where they left their horses, which was about twelve miles from town.

> I stood and looked after them as they went off, and observed to one of the preachers, that I was sorry to see the old man go off in that way, for I was persuaded he would not be quiet long; but he would try to be head of some party.[71]

Asbury called the affair "mischief" and remarked that when O'Kelly arrived to talk with him that he was "closely employed in reading 'The Cure of Divisions,' and [the] Hebrew Bible."[72] Yet he had no fear that "after all Satan's spite. . . . [the] shifting and shaking will be for good."[73] So it turned out, the meaning of the events for the Methodists, perhaps, focused in the career of William McKendree, one of those who, with O'Kelly, deserted the conference.

William McKendree and James O'Kelly were ardent personal friends, and in their close relation McKendree was accustomed to look to the older man as example; for O'Kelly had been his presiding elder in his itinerant labors. "Under these influences he was strongly biased in favor of the secessionists," and, understandably, resigned.[74] Eventually, however, he associated himself with Asbury, and, after studying the discipline carefully, concluded that the Methodist way was "agreeable to the government and regulations of the primitive Church."[75] Thereafter no one exerted himself more than he to preserve the government of the Methodist body. Some sixteen years later McKendree was elected bishop. Jesse Lee reported that the elevation was accomplished by a "large majority of votes," that "there was a good deal of peace and union among the preachers at that general conference [1808]," and that "there was a wonderful revival of religion after the Preachers returned from the general conference to their circuits."[76] Here, in narrow compass, is the essence of sect survival, and the justification of the thesis. O'Kelly, expressing independence and dissatisfaction, had conducted himself in the revolutionary spirit, and left, never to return. McKendree had tarried briefly outside, and then come back to the fold. But it is McKendree who is representative, and it is he who demonstrates the Methodist accommodation to the rising spirit of Jacksonian democracy.

Before McKendree died America experienced the tension from the threatening tyranny of the majority in conflict with the necessity of preserving standards if a society based on egalitarian theories were to endure. The Methodist counterpart of centralized authority was the episcopal power—undergirded by the support of the presiding elders. At neither level with the Methodists was there intention of abandoning the control of the church to the com-

monality of men. Jesse Lee had expressed profound disapproval of church folk who were losing their humility (that is, assuming privileges and taking authority to themselves): "Whilst I was preaching," he reported of one place, "if a well dressed person came in, the people would jump up in their pews, and slam open their doors, and thump on their pews, and slam with their hands to get the person into their pews. I was quite displeased with their pews, and with their conduct."[77]

The chronicler was not gossiping; he was simply observing an oblique example of the earth-wisdom which seems always to have informed the policies of the sects that have survived with at least one foot in heaven. What is suggested here is something apart from shameful rationalization which allowed (or forced) the Methodists to suspend their strict rules prohibiting slave-holding members from their communion as early as six months after they were enacted, although the axiom embraces this chapter of Methodism as well.[78] And if it comes to that, the Methodists were not unique among American religious denominations in accommodating to slavery. The point in question is the necessary and possible adjustment between extremes, which, in the case of Methodism, allowed them to preserve their community of brothers and sisters, and at the same time provided them a means of insuring its present operation and future progress. In part the instinctive wisdom was a reflection of a developing American government in which revolt against a centralized tyranny gave way to the pressing need of strong leadership to maintain the nation's unity. Only through powerful control could there be equal opportunity in the nation, and only through strong guardianship of the church could the original dream of a community be safeguarded.

The record of limited and immediate goals, of narrow prejudices, the stories of self interest, and the documents which tell of pettiness and human frailty make it easy to disdain the Methodist movement, and tempt the historian to dismiss the phenomena and excoriate devotees for having forgotten the vision and betrayed the ideal. O'Kelly, uncompromising, became an alien and a stranger to Methodism. McKendree capitulated and succeeded. Yet McKendree embodies the principle of compromise and adjustment which seems always necessary between contending forces; and the strength of this in-every-way first American bishop of the Methodist church lies for him, as for the Methodists whom he served, in the possibility which that principle assures for growth of the society without the abrogation of the will of the people who chose him.

CHAPTER THREE

North Carolina Methodism From the Revolution To the War of 1812

Larry E. Tise

At the conclusion of the American Revolution the Methodist persuasion was hardly a factor in the newly established state of North Carolina. Although one or two of John Wesley's emissaries in America had found their way into North Carolina just prior to the Revolution and although a dozen or so "preaching places" had been established during the intervening years of the war, as late as 1782 there were still only about fourteen hundred people in North Carolina who called themselves Methodist. Moreover, without an ordained ministry and without a viable Anglican church to nurture along Methodist societies within the state, the prospects for the rise of Methodism were dim indeed. On the eve of the famous Christmas Conference of 1784, therefore, there was little evidence to suggest that during the next thirty years the "spurious" and "dissenting" persuasion known as Methodism would become among the most important religious movements in North Carolina society.

In order to understand the history of Methodism in North Carolina during the years from the Revolution to the War of 1812, one

Larry E. Tise is Director of the North Carolina Division of Archives and History, Raleigh, N. C.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 148.

must understand something about the tentative and changing nature of American society. And one must be aware of the fact that religious institutions in American society then, as always, followed very closely upon the currents, the trials, and the failures of the American people as a whole. It is not enough to posit that Methodists were a peculiarly good, energetic, or ambient people who fought to overcome all odds and all rival institutions. Rather it is essential to note the fact that the trials, triumphs, and experiments of Methodists were dependent upon and progressed hand-in-hand with those of the society in which they lived and worked.

Following upon the conclusion of the American Revolution the American people entered into a tentative, critical period. It was a crucial time not so much as a result of either factionalism or tenditiousness in the American people, but because Americans were trying to establish novel governmental and social systems without prior workable models. Both the government and the manner of being they envisioned as proper for the late divided British colonies were tentative and experimental. Moreover, few of the authors of the system themselves believed that the experiment was wholly capable of success. Even such key individuals as Jefferson, Adams, and Washington doubted that the American nation would long remain the kind of pristine republic they sought to establish without careful watchfulness.

The tentative Confederation, created during the course of the war, was transmuted into a stronger, more centralized form of government with the adoption of the Constitution in 1787 and following. But even then the republic was torn and contorted by the rise of a new political factionalism during the course of the 1790's. The Federalists, the first ruling order, were replaced by Jeffersonian Republicans in the election of 1800. Then through a decade and a half of political bickering and continual sniping, the Jeffersonians remained in power over and against the strong will of the Federalists.

As dry and as distant as any discussion of the political order may seem from the rise of religious institutions in North Carolina, the struggles of the Federalists and the Jeffersonians were but the tip and the most visible evidence of a phenomena which crisscrossed American society and helped shape the life, work, and behavior of the lonely Methodist itinerant who trod his way through the backwoods of North Carolina. Every possibility the itinerant met and every success he achieved were contingent upon a host of political and social factors which were wholly beyond his control of

which he may not always have been aware. While his work was far removed from the seats of political power and while he may have believed that he worked within a vacuum, his very livelihood and his chances for success were dependent upon the movement of American society in a direction which could use and could nurture upon his unique contributions.

The chief social phenomena which affected the work of the itinerant were the disorganization of American social and political life at the conclusion of the American Revolution, the quest of the American people for a workable republican order, and the ever changing systems of social and political organization which were precipitated by the experiences of the American people during the first thirty years of independence. Federalism was at once a political phenomenon, a social philosophy, and a system of social organization. Jeffersonian Republicanism was an alternative political phenomenon, an alternative social philosophy, and a second mode of social organization. And Methodism was at once a religious phenomenon, a social philosophy, and a system of social organization that meshed with or responded to one or another of the national political currents.

During the immediate years following the American Revolution Methodism became entrenched in North Carolina. From the first creation of a Methodist circuit in North Carolina in 1776 and the earliest efforts of Methodist itinerants to establish a foothold in the state little was accomplished until Methodists on the national level came to grips with the problem of ecclesiastical organization. At the end of 1776 there were reported to be a total of 683 Methodists in the revolutionary state. At the end of 1782 the number had grown to only 1,492. Between 1782 and 1790 the number grew to a reported total of 8,563 whites and 1,797 blacks. Such phenomenal growth largely came to an end in the early 1790's and was not resumed again until the first decade of the nineteenth century.[1]

During the decade following the Revolution, Methodism converted from a loosely organized subsidiary movement within the Anglican Church to a separate ecclesiastical body. Unable to operate due to the collapse of the Anglican Church which had provided the sacraments and the formal ecclesiastical organization for Methodists, John Wesley finally relented in his efforts to maintain Methodist societies within the body of Anglicanism. On September 1, 1784, therefore, Wesley ordained Thomas Coke "Superintendent" of the Methodist societies in America. Following his arrival in

America on November 3, Coke called together the sixty Methodist itinerants in America, and on December 25, 1784 created the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. In an important departure from the wishes of Wesley, the assembled Methodist preachers decided not to use Wesley's term "superintendent" and made their leaders, Coke and Francis Asbury, the first bishops of the fledgling church.* In a second departure which was crucial to the early years of the church, the ministers adopted Wesley's General Rules of the United Methodist Societies with one notable addition. They declared the practice of holding men in slavery "contrary to the golden law of God . . . and the unalienable rights of mankind, as well as every principle of the Revolution . . ." and made the emancipation of slaves owned by Methodists a condition of membership.[2] As a consequence of the Christmas Conference, therefore, American Methodists finally developed an ecclesiastical structure which would permit and engender phenomenal growth and took on a social issue that would trouble them for nearly a century—especially in North Carolina.

Although Methodism had hardly gained a foothold in North Carolina prior to the Christmas Conference, North Carolina Methodists were already concerned with the structure of their religious persuasion. As early as 1779, a number of Methodist itinerants living in the state joined with some of their fellows in Virginia to deal with the troublesome question of ordinances. At Broken Back Church in Fluvanna County, Virginia, Philip Gatch, Reuben Ellis, James Foster, and LeRoy Cole united to ordain each other for the purpose of providing sacraments to their followers. In their rather startling actions they were supported by such important itinerants as John Dickens, James O'Kelly, and Francis Poythress. Disturbed by the consequences of such untoward actions on the part of itinerants in North Carolina, however, Francis Asbury succeeded in quieting and annulling what had the potential of becoming the first schism in American Methodism. The concerns of North Carolina itinerants were not entirely quieted until the Christmas Conference when they took on the function of full-flledged clergymen.[3]

At the same time North Carolina itinerants were forcing issues on the nature and function of the Methodist connexion, they were actively and energetically extending the itinerant system throughout North Carolina. Prior to the Christmas Conference, the Methodist system was divided up into wide-ranging circuits with one or more itinerants appointed to travel, preach, and

organize Methodist societies throughout the geographic area of the circuit. The first such circuit, the Carolina Circuit, was created in 1776, presumably including all of North and South Carolina. In 1778, however, the Carolina Circuit was divided into three areas, Roanoke, Tar River, and New Hope. In 1780 the Yadkin Circuit was added. And on the eve of the Christmas Conference, five additional circuits were added, including Bertie, Pasquotank, Holston, Guilford, and Salisbury. As a result of this rapid growth of circuits and the commitment of additional itinerants to the state, the Methodist population in North Carolina grew from 1,492 in 1782 to 3,446 in 1784. By that time a circuit had been created for every area of the state, including the upper elevations of the western mountains.[4]

Following upon the creation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a period of rapid growth ensued in the state of North Carolina. Between 1784 and 1790 the number of Methodists in North Carolina nearly tripled. The sixteen circuits in the state in the latter year reported a total membership of 8,563 whites and 1,797 blacks. From 1790 to 1795 the expansion leveled off, so that in the latter year the circuits of the state reported a combined total of 9,362 whites and 1,810 blacks. The combined total of 11,172 members in 1795 was the largest number of Methodists reported in any year in the eighteenth century in the state and was a total that was not again achieved until 1804.[5]

Until 1803 when the Methodist Episcopal Church divided itself into conferences, districts, and circuits to provide administrative hierarchy for various geographic areas, Methodism in North Carolina consisted merely of a series of unconnected circuits. All circuits looked for leadership to Francis Asbury, the bishop who energetically oversaw the whole Methodist system in America. The other bishop, Thomas Coke, was so often out of the country on various missionary voyages that he rarely exercised the prerogatives of his office. Until 1803 when the Church began to assume its more characteristic structure, then, all clergymen looked to Asbury for leadership, for guidance, and for their annual appointments to various circuits. Within the circuits, Methodism consisted of dozens of tiny societies and preaching places, each with its leader who served as the contact individual and local head of Methodist affairs.[6]

Until geographic conferences emerged in the first years of the nineteenth century, annual conferences of Methodist itinerants were held in various places throughout the country with ever-changing sets of representation. The first such conference held in

America following the Christmas Conference was an important meeting on April 19, 1785, at the home of Green Hill near Louisburg. In 1786 a similar conference was held in the town of Salisbury. In 1789, 1790, and 1791 a succession of such conferences were held at the meeting house of George McKnight near the Yadkin River in Forsyth County. Conferences for the next three years returned to the home of Green Hill. Typical of the scope of these conferences was the fact that the meeting at McKnight's in 1789 involved itinerants from North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. At this meeting crucial decisions were made concerning the establishment of an early Methodist college and the launching of the *Arminian Magazine,* American Methodism's first periodical journal. The first issue of the journal, while it was published in Philadelphia, bore an inscription indicating that it was issued from North Carolina on April 10, 1789.[7]

When the geographic conference system finally solidified in the early years of the nineteenth century, North Carolina was divided up and parceled out to first two and later three geographic conferences. Beginning in 1803, the bulk of North Carolina became a part of the Virginia Conference, with small segments of southeastern and southwestern North Carolina being allocated to the South Carolina Conference. The mountain areas of northwestern North Carolina developed separately, first as the Holston District of the Western Conference and later as the Holston District of the Tennessee Conference. The facts that North Carolina Methodists did not have their own geographic annual conference until 1837 and that they were divided up among three separate conferences created an absence of state focus and contributed to the relatively slow growth of Methodism within the state throughout the period to the War of 1812. The number of Methodists within the state actually decreased from 11,172 in 1795 to 7,920 in 1799. The number remained basically constant until 1804, when a new period of growth began. Between 1804 until the end of the War of 1812, the number of Methodists in the state, as closely as can be calculated from the three separate conferences, grew from 8,402 to 22,893.[8]

Contrary to traditional myths of history, therefore, Methodism did not develop as spectacularly as has been assumed. Whereas it has been thought that Methodism swept across the face of North Carolina winning the allegiance of ever growing numbers and an ever larger proportion of North Carolinians, this is not the case. After an initial period of rapid growth, Methodists in North Carolina represented 2.6 percent of the state's total population in 1790.

As the state's population grew between 1790 and 1800, the number and proportion who were Methodist decreased, only 1.8 percent calling themselves Methodist in 1800. By 1810 the percentage of Methodists had increased to 3.4. But by 1820 the figure had decreased slightly to 3.3 percent. From 1790 to 1820, therefore, the expansion of Methodism barely kept pace with the growth of the state's population.[9]

Despite the relative insignificance of Methodism in relationship to the total population of North Carolina, such figures do not reveal the impact of North Carolina Methodists on either North Carolina society or the development of Methodism as one of the foremost religious institutions in the state and in America. While the numbers may have appeared few, Methodism shared with other religious institutions a fundamental responsibility for organizing North Carolina society following the Revolution. Moreover, North Carolina Methodists had a great impact on the shape of Methodist institutions in America.

To get a notion of the scope and extent of Methodism in North Carolina society one need but follow the course of Methodism's itinerant bishop, Francis Asbury. From 1779 until his death in 1816, Asbury visited in North Carolina at least once each year. While Asbury did not visit in all areas of the state each year, his perigrinations over a period of time took him to almost every hamlet in the land where Methodists were forming societies and building churches.

In 1780 Methodists from Virginia were spilling over into North Carolina. At the same time itinerants were fighting for a strong foothold in the state. That year Asbury entered North Carolina across the Roanoke River and spent the bulk of his time in the area of Halifax, Franklin, Warren, Wake, Orange, and Chatham counties. During the course of his fifty-three day stay in North Carolina Asbury located and identified the leading Methodists and Methodist societies in the state. Among the clerical and lay leaders he contacted were John Dickens in Halifax, author of the first Methodist *Discipline,* creator of the Methodist Book Concern, and among the leading early clergymen in Methodism; the Ellis family which contributed a number of clergymen to pioneer Methodism; Major Green Hill, a local preacher, farmer, and prominent political figure, whose home provided the site for four annual conferences; James O'Kelly, a prominent clergyman who challenged Asbury on a number of issues until he finally withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church and formed the Republican Methodist Church

in 1793; Francis Poythress, Beverly Allen, and Richard Ivey, three clergymen who contributed heavily to the extension of Methodism throughout North Carolina. In addition, Asbury found strong Methodist societies sprinkled throughout north central North Carolina.[10]

On this early visit to North Carolina, Asbury had varying opinions of the people of the state and of the nature of Methodism in the state. After only a week Asbury admitted, "I had too mean an opinion of Carolina; it is a much better country, and the people live much better than I expected from the information given me." A few days later, however, he commented, "I can see little else but cabins in these parts, built with poles; and such a country as no man ever saw for a carriage." In Caswell County he found the roads so bad that he had to have his carriage "refit almost every week" and the people so poor that they had been "much put to it, the past year, for bread." And as for the institution of slavery in North Carolina he was disturbed to see "the manner of keeping these poor people."[11]

When Asbury came to North Carolina in 1790 and 1791, the situation was quite different. During the course of those two years, he made five visits to the state and, in the process, saw each area of the state in which Methodism was developing. He again visited in the north central portion of the state where Methodists were sorely divided in their allegiances to either Asbury or James O'Kelly over the issue of episcopal power. He next went to the area of the Catawba River and Rutherfordton where Methodism was just being implanted. Upon his return from Tennessee he found Methodist institutions flourishing in the New and Yadkin river valleys. On his next trip, he found Methodist societies in Gates and Currituck counties in the northeast and a few others in a thin line along the coast to Wilmington and into South Carolina. Despite the division in the ranks which James O'Kelly was fomenting in central North Carolina, the picture drawn by Asbury in 1790 was one of religious ferment and activity in all regions of the state.[12]

By the time of his various visits in 1800 and 1801, Methodist institutions were coming to be more strictly confined to the growing towns of the state. Whereas in earlier years Asbury had beaten the bushes to find preaching places, by 1800 the focal centers of Methodist activity were coming to be the towns. During the course of the two years Asbury preached at a number of courthouses, at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, in the State

House in Raleigh, and in rising churches in Wilmington, New Bern, Washington, Tarboro, Halifax, Murfreesboro, and Asheville. Despite every evidence of the solidification of Methodism in the towns of North Carolina, Asbury was not happy with the condition of the church in North Carolina at this time. His comment at Halifax was typical: "O, the awful state of religion in this circuit."[13]

Between 1800 and 1810-11, Methodism experienced a revolution in growth and membership. The focus of the growth and activity, despite the appearance of camp meetings, continued to be the villages and towns. When Asbury came to North Carolina in those years, his attention was given to the towns where larger congregations and churches were emerging. For example, in Fayetteville he spoke in "our enlarged house," at Wilmington in "the new chapel," and at Edenton in "the new chapel." In almost every town Asbury visited, he found a lively interest in religion. He found Wilmington "alive with commerce, and there is no small stir in religion." In Raleigh in 1811 he found a grand reception prepared for what was likely the largest and most significant religious event for Methodists during the period in North Carolina. The Virginia Conference met in Raleigh for a week long meeting that year with preaching sessions three times a day. Because Raleigh did not yet have its own church, the meeting occurred in the State House, with no less than two thousand individuals present for some of the services. The lengthy and impressive series of meetings paved the way for the construction of the first Methodist church in Raleigh, the acceptance of Methodism among the highest officials of the state, and the continuation of a grand revival which made Methodism a permanently important fixture in North Carolina society.[14]

While Asbury's journal charts the development of Methodism from backwoods evangelicalism to respectable town revivalism, his journal does not reveal the inner currents and social impact of Methodism in North Carolina. While one can list the trail blazing leadership of North Carolina Methodists through such actions as the convening of the first annual conference at Green Hill's, the launching of perhaps the earliest conference school, Cokesbury, around 1793, and the beginning of the *Arminian Magazine,* such claims would belie the true history of Methodism in North Carolina between the Revolution and the War of 1812. The true nature of Methodist experience in North Carolina can only be revealed by looking at a couple of themes which ran throughout the period. Among these themes were the experience of Methodists with schism in the church, with the problem of slavery in American society,

and with the broader problem of acceptance by Americans as a viable and respectable religious persuasion.

Methodist history in North Carolina in the period was affected heavily by schism within the ranks. It is, in fact, likely that the rise and fall of Methodist membership in the state was strongly affected by an ongoing contentiousness that seems to have been almost restricted to North Carolina. The central figure in the process was James O'Kelly. O'Kelly joined the Methodist ranks as an itinerant in 1778 in southeastern Virginia and continued his association as one of the ordained clergymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church until 1793. From his entry in the church until his departure in disgust in 1793, O'Kelly was a source of controversy and disagreement. And because O'Kelly was highly respected as a clergyman and related his various causes to the prevailing moods of the country, his disagreements with the direction of Methodism as an ecclesiastical body served well as the roots of schism in the church.

From 1779 when O'Kelly associated himself with those itinerants who urged the ordination of Methodist preachers in America until the establishment of a quadrennial General Conference in 1792, O'Kelly was normally among those in opposition to the creation of a hierarchical episcopal church. Although he was quiet on the subject during the course of the Christmas Conference of 1784, each step toward a church hierarchy and a strong episcopacy thereafter drew his opposition. While some historians have looked upon O'Kelly as an overly ambitious young man, he always responded to one of the national strains of social consciousness. When O'Kelly objected to measures taken by Asbury to create a Council to govern the church between 1787 and 1790, he reacted in both the terms and the language of anti-federalists to the ratification of the American Constitution. When O'Kelly opposed the creation of a powerful episcopacy and the consolidation of power in the hands of Asbury, he did so in the same terms that anti-federalists berated the creation of a powerful American presidency. Whether or not O'Kelly appealed to the philosophy of anti-federalism for personal reasons, it is certain that his tactics against Asbury's Council and a powerful episcopacy struck responsive and meaningful chords in central North Carolina—a seat of anti-federalism.[15]

Having largely won his way on the matter of the Council by 1791, O'Kelly next turned his attention to the first quadrennial General Conference in 1792, called in part to settle some of the issues involved in the debate over the Council. O'Kelly came to

the conference in Baltimore urging that it address itself to the "abolition of the arbitrary aristocracy" in the church and to the establishment of a permanent "general conference of at least two thirds of the preachers as a check upon every thing." Throughout the conference, O'Kelly urged an anti-federalist, democratizing approach to ecclesiastical affairs. Overwhelmed by those who endorsed Asbury's approach to centralized authority and a powerful episcopate, however, O'Kelly lost the battle. The emergence of what might be called an "episcopal party" or polity in the Methodist Episcopal Church paralleled almost precisely the emergence of the Federalist Party in American government.[16]

O'Kelly's course following the crucial General Conference of 1792 continued to parallel the pattern of American political history. By 1793, O'Kelly and his followers, William McKendree (temporarily), Rice Haggard, John Allen, and John Robertson, had withdrawn from the Methodist Episcopal Church and formed the Republican Methodist Church. Responding to the concurrent philosophy which undergirded the creation of "republican societies" on the model of the French Revolution throughout America, O'Kelly went about organizing dissenting Methodists in democratic societies under a democratic polity. Laymen and clergy were extended democratic rights which were not possible under the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The church grew apace during the first year with more than a thousand members. A like number joined the second year. As the movement spread throughout North Carolina, membership in the Methodist Church dropped by one third before 1799. But the movement was so democratic, so disorganized, and so closely intertwined with the philosophy and fortunes of the French Revolution that it dissipated in the same violent reaction which Americans finally took toward the excesses of events in France. By 1801 when the reaction to French-style republicanism had run its course in America, O'Kelly and his followers wisely renamed their movement simply the "Christian Church."[17]

In addition to bearing the torch of republicanism, the O'Kelly schism became the focus of antislavery sentiment in North Carolina Methodism. William McKendree, a brief exponent of O'Kelly's cause, once described the Republican Methodist Church O'Kelly espoused as *"a republican, no-slavery, glorious Church."* If O'Kelly's brand of Methodism was whole-heartedly opposed to Negro slavery, it was a departure as well from the general tendency of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the 1790's. Whereas the church as a whole,

reflecting the general tenor of the nation, drifted toward a compromise with republicanism and with slave-holding, O'Kelly represented in many ways the fundamental and original direction of Methodists in America.[18]

While Negro slavery was intertwined in the fabric of American and North Carolina society during the colonial experience, the American Revolution with its emphasis on social and political freedom tended to undermine the institution. The rhetoric of freedom in the Revolution unleashed a contagion of liberty that threatened slavery and other forms of social bondage. The Revolution, in fact, set in motion a process which led to the eventual manumission of slaves north of the Mason-Dixon line. The same spirit of freedom which led to the framing of manumission laws in the northern states began to infect American churches in the wake of the Revolution. By 1780 Methodist itinerants gathered in Baltimore began to take measures against slaveholding which formed the basis for the revolutionary action of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784 at the Christmas Conference. By rule the Conference prescribed that all Methodists owning slaves must take immediate action to divest themselves of their human property—the first such action taken by an American church.[19]

The fact that such a rule was adopted by a set of clergymen who largely derived from large slaveholding states of the South is a tribute to their youthful idealism and to the impact of the American Revolution on their thought and actions. What occurred following the adoption of the rule, particularly in North Carolina, was an indication of the intractibility of slavery as an American institution and of the need for American religious institutions, if they are to survive, to reflect the values and tendencies of American society. The course of the ensuing struggle over slavery among Methodists is instructive because much of the battle was waged within the confines of North Carolina.

Three months after the Christmas Conference, Thomas Coke, the individual who was perhaps most instrumental in forcing the adoption of the rule on slaveholding, made his way into North Carolina. Arriving at Edenton on March 21, 1785, Coke promptly rejected the support of Charles Pettigrew, an Episcopal minister and longtime friend of Methodists in the town, because he was a slaveholder. Seven days later Coke met another devoted friend of Methodists at Roanoke Chapel, Devereux Jarratt, and alienated him as well by attacking his slaveholding practices. Until April 1,

Coke disseminated his antislavery notions in private. On that day, however, he wrote, "I now begin to venture to exhort our societies to emancipate their slaves." For nearly a month thereafter Coke preached openly against slavery in the churches of north central North Carolina. Wherever he went, Coke claimed he was threatened by mobs "with staves and clubs."[20]

The matter of Coke's antislavery activity and of the Methodist rule on slavery came to a head at the first annual conference at Green Hill's home near Louisburg on April 20, 1785. At the conference Coke vented his spleen on the subject of slavery and attempted to block the renewal of a Methodist clergyman who opposed the stringent rule on slavery. Infuriated by the ill-advised tactics employed by Coke, the Carolina clergymen overrode Coke and reinstated the minister. A week later, just across the border in Virginia, Coke ran into similar resistance at another conference. At this conference, however, James O'Kelly was present and became the sole defender of Coke's insistence on the manumission of slaves by Methodists. The struggle went on apace for another month until the third conference in Baltimore on June 1, at which time the rule on slavery was suspended "on account of the great opposition that had been given it, especially in the new circuits." Thus ended the only attempt by a national church in America to end slaveholding among its members by proscribing slaveholding members.[21]

The most crucial influence on the defeat of the rule was the vocal and animated opposition of North Carolina Methodists. But the sensitivity of Methodist clergymen to slavery among the laity did not end with the miserable failure of the rule on membership. Throughout the period from the Revolution to the War of 1812, slavery and the role of blacks in the church continued to pose great difficulties for the state's Methodists. Almost from the beginning Negroes, whether slave or free, were permitted to become members of Methodist societies. Throughout the period from one fifth to one third of all Methodists in the state were blacks. By the first decade of the nineteenth century, separate churches for "Africans" were being established in Wilmington, New Bern, Fayetteville, Edenton, and elsewhere. The Methodist church at Fayetteville, in fact, was established by Henry Evans, a talented free black who won the confidence of local whites. The incorporation of blacks in the work of the church was obvious by 1805 when Francis Asbury traveled from town to town in the state preaching to congregations of blacks.[22]

But the incorporation of blacks in the church did not mean that slavery and racism were not problems for Methodists. Although Francis Asbury was much more careful than his fellow bishop Coke in public expressions of his attitudes on slavery, he was not hesitant to record in his journal what he saw and felt. In 1796 near New Bern he deplored the "conduct of some Methodists, that hire out slaves at public places to the highest bidder, to cut, skin, and starve them; I think such members ought to be dealt with." The situation had not changed by 1809, when Asbury began to note a concerted effort on the part of masters to keep their slaves from hearing Methodist preachers because they were "afraid of the influence of our principles."[23] And such was the direction in which matters relating to slavery were headed at the end of the period. Methodist clergymen and laymen, except for James O'Kelly and his followers, had largely made their peace with American society and with the practice of slaveholding.

The pattern North Carolina Methodists followed in ecclesiastical polity and in their dealings with slavery was largely duplicated in their approach to American society. As the period from the Revolution to the War of 1812 wore on, Methodists, despite their frequent revivalistic antics, became increasingly socially acceptable. While they were viewed initially as dissenters from traditional religious practices and institutions, by the War of 1812 they had become the substance of what it meant to be religious Americans.

The growing respectability of the Methodists in North Carolina can be charted through the eyes of the Moravians at Salem. Although they were pietists and had once appealed to early Methodists in England, by the last decade of the eighteenth century Salem Methodists were becoming quite formalistic and a part of the religious establishment in North Carolina. When Methodists began to appear in Salem and the surrounding area in the 1780's, the Moravians looked upon them as sometimes wild and always troublesome practitioners of religion. They thought of Thomas Coke as a pompous visionary and of Asbury as only a bit more tasteful. Local Methodists were annoying and disorderly in the extreme, as they took to the streets for preaching services and meetings.[24]

The suspicion with which Moravians viewed Methodists, while restrained, turned into open disdain around 1802. During the course of that year Methodists across North Carolina began the practice of holding camp meetings and evangelistic services where "loud cries and shouts of praise are heard," where "the groans of

the distressed went up," and where all "pleaded with the Lord." The Moravians kept a watchful eye on the week long camp meetings of the Methodists, perpetually reporting "a very bad impression" of the conduct at such meetings. The "big meetings" attracted both saints and sinners, free men and slaves. One such meeting attracted twenty Methodist preachers and was described by a Moravian writer as follows:

> At this place they meet yearly in the shade of the trees, all under brush having been cleared from ten acres. In the middle is a Square, surrounded by wagons and tents. At the four corners of the Square great fires of pine logs burn all night; and watchmen are appointed to make the rounds and prevent disorder. Morning and evening, and often during the night, there is singing and praying in the tents. During the day there is much preaching.

It was the era of the original camp meetings in America and nowhere were camp meetings more popular nor more profitably used than in North Carolina.[25]

The impression Moravians and likely other North Carolinians had of Methodists in the midst of the great revival of 1802 and following is revealed clearly in an account of a visit by Lorenzo "Crazy" Dow to Salem in 1805. Known for his unusual antics at religious services, Dow created a sensation among Moravians, one of them writing as follows:

> About 11 o'clock the preacher [Dow] arrived, and the moment he dismounted he began to preach, at a place in a field outside the town which our Brethren had made ready for him. His preaching lasted about three hours. This man has made a great reputation in the land, but our members did not like his sermon. . . . Immediately after the preaching he mounted his horse, rode through our town without stopping anywhere for an instant. . . . The many people were quiet and orderly beyond our expectation . . .

The presence of such clergymen merely confirmed the low and disdainful opinion Moravians held for Methodists.[26]

Following the spate of revivalism and camp meetings between 1802 and 1810, however, Methodists became more palatable to the Moravians. As the period of the War of 1812 approached, there was no diminution in the number of camp meetings or in revivalistic approaches to religion. But the revival became, after a period of a few years, a patterned social practice, a mode of behavior expected of certain religious groups. By 1811 Methodist preachers were holding services in the center of Salem without molestation from Moravians. By the following year, Moravians and Methodists were visiting at each others religious services. And finally in 1818, a Methodist preacher sought to hold a religious service in the major Moravian church in Salem and permission was granted. Both

Moravians and Methodists attended the meeting, with a Moravian reporting afterward, "he preached an evangelical sermon on the new birth of the heart, to the edification of the numbers present." As that event indicated, Methodism had come of age in North Carolina. It had become as socially acceptable as any other religious persuasion in America.[27]

The social acceptance of Methodists and of Methodism by the band of Moravians in Salem was symbolic of the stage at which the followers of Wesley had arrived by the period of the War of 1812. No longer British itinerants or mere evangelical circuit riders, Methodist clergymen had during the course of forty years entered into and made a permanent place in North Carolina society. Whereas only four decades had passed since the first Methodist itinerant had crossed over the border into northeastern North Carolina introducing a new religious persuasion, whereas the growth and acceptance of Methodism had been by no means spectacular, and whereas the entire course of Methodism in the state had been fraught with difficulties and schisms, by 1815 the Methodist Episcopal Church had established a firm beachhead in North Carolina. Methodist itinerants had quixotically challenged the religious establishment and had gained acceptance, had appealed to all levels of North Carolina society, and had challenged the institution of slavery, losing that battle miserably. While the early itinerants may have believed that they could alter the society and fashion it into one grand Methodist society, they found that ideal impossible. By 1815, they had blended into North Carolina society as a fully acceptable religious persuasion.

**Editor's Note:* Actually Francis Asbury on his own initiative assumed the title of "bishop." The Christmas Conference did not adopt that terminology.

CHAPTER FOUR

Cokesbury School

N. Fred Jordan

Even before the Methodist Episcopal Church was formed in 1784, Methodists in North Carolina were committed to organizing a school for their children. In June of 1780, inspired by John Wesley's school at Kingswood, England, Francis Asbury met with the Rev. John Dickins of Halifax County, North Carolina, to discuss building a similar school in America.[1] A subscription was drawn and two men of that area—Gabriel Long and a Mr. Bustion —have the honor of being the first contributors.[2] Their money was probably used for Cokesbury College in Abingdon, Maryland, but North Carolinians wanted and needed a Cokesbury of their own. Early in the 1790's, Cokesbury School, North Carolina, was built on a "beautiful eminence"[3] overlooking the Yadkin river in what is now Davie County. It may have been the first district school organized in American Methodism,[4] and in 1794 was the first school to be listed in the Conference *Minutes* as an episcopal appointment.[5] Unfortunately it was short lived and until recently little was known of its operation.

A student's notebook, or commonplace book,[6] used at Cokesbury School by George McClaskey, has recently turned up in the papers of Etheldred Ellis, an early local Methodist preacher. Though brief, its careful record of McClaskey's business and personal transactions provides first-hand information about the school. It also

This chapter on Cokesbury School was written by The Reverend N. Fred Jordan, a ministerial member of the Western North Carolina Conference of the United Methodist Church and currently pastor of Salem United Methodist Church, Albemarle, North Carolina.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 149.

establishes a link between Cokesbury College and Cokesbury School that has been implied in their common name.

George McClaskey was the only son of John and Elizabeth McClaskey.[7] John McClaskey was born in Londonderry, Ireland, in 1756 and at the age of sixteen emigrated to America, settling in Salem County, New Jersey.[8] In 1780 he married Elizabeth Ffrith, and George was probably born the following year.[9] In 1781 and -82 John McClaskey experienced a religious awakening. He started preaching in 1785 and during the next thirty years served a variety of Methodist appointments from Maryland to New York. Asbury called him "a man of strong mind, a plain but useful preacher."[10]

It took a strong mind and determination to overcome the problems John McClaskey's ministry created for his family. His salary was low.[11] Long periods away from home strained family life.[12] In his father's absence the full responsibility for raising George fell on his mother. Faced with such difficulties, most eighteenth century preachers left the itinerancy if they married.[13] John McClaskey was an exception.

The newly formed Methodist Episcopal Church was aware of these problems. As one of its first acts of business, the 1784 Christmas Conference voted to build a college in Abingdon, Maryland.[14] It was named Cokesbury, honoring the first two bishops, Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury. Its purpose included the education and discipline of the sons of preachers. Free tuition made it possible for them to attend. The conference hoped the college would remove a burden of concern from men like John McClaskey, as it supplied what the parent was unable to give "because of his labors in the Gospel."[15]

Cokesbury College opened in 1787.[16] It was modeled after John Wesley's Kingswood School,[17] and accepted students who were seven years old or older.[18] It is therefore possible that George McClaskey entered Cokesbury College as early as 1788. Unfortunately the college and its records were destroyed by a fire in 1795.

Cokesbury College, however, did not meet all of Methodism's educational needs. As the frontier expanded there was a corresponding need for new schools. In 1789 a delegation of Kentucky Methodists made the long and treacherous journey over the mountains to attend a conference at McKnight's meeting house in North Carolina. Their main purpose in coming was to win support for building what later became Bethel School in Kentucky.[19] Their enthusiasm was catching. While Asbury's Journal does not mention plans for a school in North Carolina, the organization of Cokesbury

School probably began as a result of this same conference. The future site of the school was only a few miles from McKnight's across the Yadkin river.

In 1791 Asbury sent an open letter to all Methodist societies officially calling for the organization of district schools operated on the same educational principles as Cokesbury College. The schools were to be smaller than the college, with an initial estimated cost for each of one hundred pounds. The only teacher was to be a "skilful, pious young man of the society," with a salary equal to that of a traveling preacher.[20] Cokesbury School in North Carolina was organized by James Parks and Hardy Jones as one of these district schools.

James Parks was an able preacher[21] "of estimable traits"[22] who had served a number of prominent North and South Carolina appointments. His work had known both numerical success and the trial of Methodism's first schism with William Hammett.[23] As a member of the 1789 conference at McKnight's, as the preacher for the Salisbury circuit in 1790, and as presiding elder of the Salisbury, Anson, and Yadkin circuits in 1793, Parks guided the organization of the school.

Hardy Jones, a prosperous farmer from Mecklenburg County, Virginia, had moved his family to the Yadkin river at Phelps ferry sometime during the 1780's. Since he was an active Methodist, his home soon became a regular stop for Methodist preachers.[24] James Parks may have known this family before they moved from Virginia,[25] but certainly was in their North Carolina home regularly while serving the Salisbury circuit. At some time prior to the summer of 1794 Parks married Jones's ward Elizabeth.[26]

As a married preacher James Parks faced the same difficulties as John McClaskey. Organizing Cokesbury School was a solution to these problems as well as a worthy service to the sons of fellow Methodists. By establishing the school and securing the position as principal for himself, Parks was able to stay at home with his wife and continue his ministry.

The organization of Cokesbury School also solved problems for Hardy Jones. Jones had a large family and often found their number swelled by orphans he took into his home. By building Cokesbury on his property and having James Parks as the principal, Jones was assured that the boys would receive a good education.

The exact date the school opened is unknown. A. W. Cummings has suggested 1790,[27] but there is no evidence to support this claim. In 1886 Rev. Matthew H. Moore discovered a Latin-

Greek grammar containing the inscription "George McClosky, Cokesbury School, Rowan Co., Aug. 9, 1793."[28] This inscription suggests that Parks opened and began operation of the school during his year as presiding elder. He may have lived at the school and managed his other church responsibilities from there. It was not, however, until the conference of December 10, 1793, that Asbury officially assigned James Parks to Cokesbury School.[29]

When the school opened, Parks and Jones needed the help and guidance of someone familiar with the Methodist plan of education. There is no evidence that either man had any prior experience in this field. Proper textbooks were also needed if the academic program was to be consistent with Cokesbury College and Kingswood School. In developing the curriculum at Kingswood Wesley had been critical of the books used in other schools and the order in which they were read. Good books were a prerequisite for good education.[30] Whenever possible these books should be purchased from the newly created Methodist Book Concern headed by John Dickins who in his advertisements pointed out that profits were used for the "general benefit" of the church.[31] George McClaskey was in a unique position to meet both of these needs, familiarity with the Wesleyan educational plan and access to suitable books.

A logical place for the district schools to look for leadership was Cokesbury College. At least one school, Union in Pennsylvania, later hired a Cokesbury graduate as its first teacher.[32] In November of 1793, Francis Asbury wrote to the college's president, Dr. Jacob Hall, "I shall be obliged to you to lead on Bliss, Gibbs, and McClasky into learning and teaching."[33] It is not clear whether McClaskey was actually at the college or the school at this time,[34] but his commonplace book does confirm his association with the college and with those named in Asbury's letter.

Under the heading "Abingdon," the site of the college, McClaskey listed the following names in his commonplace book:

Dr. Jacob Hall PCC
Mr. John Hargrove
Mr. Chrn Warkey
Mr. Charles Tait TCC
Mr. John Quarles
Mr. Lewis Dawson
Mr. James Baker
Mr. Wm Gibbson

Mr. Abel Bliss
Mr. Joshua Reece
Thomas Turner

The letters "PCC" identify Hall as the president of Cokesbury College, and "Charles Tait TCC" was a teacher. The other names probably refer to students or others connected with the college. The son of a minister named Abel Bliss is known to have attended Cokesbury, where Asbury said he was "educated and not spoiled."[35] This son was probably the Bliss mentioned in Asbury's letter and in McClaskey's list. The Gibbs from Asbury's letter may refer to McClaskey's William Gibbson.

If George McClaskey had been born in 1781 and had entered the college in 1788 at the age of seven, he could have been completing the fifth grade in 1793 at approximately twelve years of age. Though still quite young, his presence at Cokesbury School provided an important link between its curriculum, discipline, and operation, and that of Cokesbury College.

George McClaskey was also a help to the school in the area of books. His father was interested in the Methodist Book Concern and later served on the standing committee to supervise its operation.[36] It is therefore not surprising that in the summer of 1794, and probably in 1793 as well, George McClaskey delivered a shipment of books to Cokesbury School. Unfortunately McClaskey's commonplace book covers only 1794, and nothing is known of his 1793 association with the school.

Traveling from Baltimore, McClaskey stopped in Salem, North Carolina, on July 23, 1794, where he loaned a Mr. Ellis[37] twenty shillings. This was the last town on his journey. From Salem he headed into the country,[38] passed McKnight's meeting house, and crossed the Yadkin river at Phelps Ferry. From the ferry he could see the school on a nearby hill. The log building rested on large stones which served as foundation pillars.[39] Asbury described it as being "twenty feet square, two stories high [, and] well set out with doors and windows."[40] The first floor was used as a classroom, while the second floor may have served as living quarters for the principal, the boys, or both.

The building also served as a church for the surrounding farms. It is, therefore, not surprising that twenty-two hymn books formed the largest part of McClaskey's book shipment. These hymn books were pocket size, and contained three hundred hymns.[41] As early as 1789 Asbury preached to this congregation at Hardy Jones's.[42]

In December of 1794 and again in 1799 he preached in the school house.[43] James Parks probably served as the regular pastor with occasional preaching by the minister assigned to the Salisbury circuit. The present United Methodist Church in Advance, North Carolina, grew directly from the school.[44]

The hymn books were also used by the school. Each day began and ended with the reading of scripture, singing, and prayer.[45] One of the primary goals of all Methodist education was to "Unite the pair so long disjoin'd, knowledge and vital piety."[46] Educated at Oxford, John Wesley considered scholarship to be important; yet a growing personal faith was the heart of his religion and life. At Cokesbury School these two elements of faith and knowledge were brought together.

The twenty-two hymn books may reflect the anticipated size of the school. Asbury said of Cokesbury School, "This house is not too large, as some others are."[47] George McClaskey records the names of only eight students. Hardy Jones had two sons at the school—Martin and Wiley. Bird Hughes, the orphan son of Joseph Hughes, was also living with Hardy Jones, and was apparently a student.[48] Bird's brother Epps is not mentioned by McClaskey, but was living with Jones and could also have been a student.[49] There were three Davidson brothers at Cokesbury—George, John, and Richmond. They were probably from Anson County.[50] Finally Thomas Jarmon, possibly of Baltimore, was at the school along with McClaskey.[51] Since Cokesbury College began in 1787 with only twenty-five students, the enrollment at the school also was probably very limited.

On August 6, 1794, thirteen days after McClaskey arrived, he began selling books. Martin and Wiley Jones as well as Thomas Jarmon each purchased a "Lattin grammer" (sic).[52] One of the Davidsons purchased a beginning reader in Latin, *Selectae e Profanis,*[53] for himself and an *Aesops Fable* for his brother. On September fifth Richmond Davidson bought a *Selectae Veteri,* which was "for the use of those who [were] entering on the study of the Latin language."[54] Later that same month George Davidson bought a Greek grammar and John Davidson bought a Greek lexicon.[55] Apparently they planned to study together.

Not all the books at Cokesbury were sold by McClaskey. In September he records buying two books from the Davidsons. He paid four shillings for a "Corn Nepos"[56] and eight shillings for a "small Virgil." McClaskey bought the "Corn Nepos" on the nineteenth of September and sold it on the twenty-second to Martin

Jones. The selling price was again four shillings. Martin Jones also purchased an exercise book and one "Erasmus."[57]

It seems clear, therefore, that the curriculum at Cokesbury School, like that of both Cokesbury College and Kingswood School, was based on the classics. There was even some doubt in McClaskey's mind as to whether North Carolina's Cokesbury should be called a school or a college. In the front of his commonplace book he wrote, "George McClaskey's Book, Cokesbury College, Rowan County, North Carolina."[58] The term college, however, was used loosely in American Methodist education, and even the Maryland Cokesbury was for all practical purposes an American version of Wesley's Kingswood School.

McClaskey sold at least one book to someone outside the school. William Snow, a local farmer, bought a copy of John Wesley's popular guide to medicine, *Primitive Physic*.[59] McClaskey charged Snow twenty percent more than the Book Concern's recommended price,[60] but he later had trouble collecting his money. Since this sale took place on Sunday, September 14, 1794, Snow could have been at the school house for worship.

In the absence of stores, McClaskey had to depend on people living near the school for many of his personal needs. In September James Parks sold him a pair of shoes for ten shillings. Later, when a buckle broke, Parks was probably the one who repaired it for another two shillings. Mrs. Edmund Holden, whose farm was nearby,[61] sold George some "Linnen" (sic) that Elizabeth Parks then used to make George a pair of "breeches" and a pair of "Drawers."

Early in September McClaskey bought a "quire of paper, 1 paper of ink powder, [and] 1 box Wafers."[62] These were standard school supplies, but McClaskey had something else on his mind. On September fifth he wrote to his father by a Mr. Bean.[63] Only a little over a month had passed, but George was already homesick. He wrote in his commonplace book, "I wish I was in Baltimore." On the fifteenth he received a quick answer from his father, dated September 11, 1794. The content of this letter is unknown, but George did remain at the school a short time longer.

Classes in Latin and Greek continued to progress in October of 1794, as John Davidson purchased "1 *Juvenal Expeorgata, Clavis Homerica* or a book to parse Homer with, one Xenophon, [and] Homer." This was McClaskey's last sale. As his homesickness grew worse he wrote in his commonplace book, "I am very desireous of going home." In anticipation of leaving he began to close out his

accounts, pay his bills, and collect any money still owed him. His total expense came to two pounds and six shillings. Missing from his records are any payments for tuition, room, or board. Neither does he record receiving money for services rendered to the school if he was used as a teacher. While his commonplace book was originally set up to run through 1796, he left North Carolina and returned to Baltimore in November of 1794, after staying less than four months.[64]

The departure of McClaskey may have raised questions about the future of the school. Perhaps others were homesick or tired of this out-of-the-way place. The following month Asbury was in North Carolina, and on December 21, 1794, preached at the school.[65] His scripture was I Corinthians 15:58,

> Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord. (KJV)

There is no way of knowing whether the leaders at Cokesbury School did remain "steadfast" and "unmoveable . . . abounding in the work of the Lord." There is no evidence that the school was open after December, 1794, though it probably continued for a time. The 1795 Conference *Minutes* omit Cokesbury School and record the "location" of James Parks.[66] Neither name appears again in the *Minutes*. Parks may have located in order to continue his work at the school, or this omission may mark the end of the school's short life. Asbury did not visit this area again until 1799, when he wrote, "I said but little at the Academical school house, now a house for God."[67] The school therefore passed out of existence sometime between December of 1794 and 1799.

Cokesbury School failed for two reasons. First, it was poorly located in an isolated area. While convenient for Parks and Jones, the site offered little to boys like George McClaskey who were accustomed to the city. A second and more important problem was money. Asbury anticipated financial support from "legacies, subscriptions, and a charity sermon once a year."[68] Methodists, however, were poor, and money-raising was difficult. In raising funds for the college Asbury had once referred to himself as "a bishop and a beggar."[69] James Parks must have found similar problems at the school. Even George McClaskey was unable to mark "paid" after every account owed him.

Though brief in duration, Cokesbury School still had an impact on the lives it touched. At least one student, Wiley Jones, entered

the Methodist ministry in 1800, and served for a short time in the itinerant ranks.[70] George McClaskey spent his few remaining years in Baltimore, where he died July 10, 1804.[71] On August 8, 1804, Asbury received "a pensive letter from Elder John M'C[l]asky, lamenting the death of his son:—but *one* —but only *one* —alas!"[72] Bird Hughes also died young.[73] A Richmond Davidson lived in Wadesboro, North Carolina, in the 1820's, where he and his wife were farmers.[74]

In the early 1800's James Parks and Hardy Jones moved their families to Martinsborough in Surry County, North Carolina.[75] The town was later renamed Jonesville, in honor of Hardy Jones. Even though their first efforts failed, these two men never gave up hope of someday reorganizing Cokesbury School. On February 20, 1816, a parcel of ground was set aside near Jonesville for an academy. Jones and Parks were two of the original trustees,[76] and Parks was apparently the first and only teacher. It later grew to be of considerable size and served both as a male and female institution.[77]

It is significant that Parks and Jones were able to organize the Jonesville Academy. Cokesbury School, like most of the district schools, and Cokesbury College itself, had a short life.[78] In 1820, however, the General Conference issued a call to each annual conference "to establish, as soon as practical, literary institutions, under their own control, in such way and manner as they may think proper."[79] America had changed a great deal since 1791, and the time was at last right for Methodist-sponsored educational institutions. This second drive for schools was a success, and Jonesville Academy was part of this success.

CHAPTER FIVE

North Carolina Methodists in the Nineteenth Century: Church and Society

Donald G. Mathews

Traditionally Methodists have made a distinction between the church and society, or at least they did so throughout the nineteenth century. The revivals which spilled over into North Carolina from Virginia during the Revolutionary era saved thousands and set them on the path to Christian perfection, ever conscious of life as a struggle between the destructive allurement of "carelessness" and pleasure and the divine command of obedience and self-discipline. The entire Methodist ethos was suffused with this conflict, for it could not be contained within the tortured psyche of individuals who relied upon each other for comfort and encouragement. The disjunction within believers' consciousness became more concrete as they surveyed the "world" or society around them from the comforting vantage offered by the fellowship of Methodists—the church. From the Revolution to the twentieth century, Methodists were harangued, cautioned, and taught about the importance of being different from people who had not been convicted of sin and converted to Christ through the power of His Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, even as they nodded in agreement to angry attacks upon worldings and the world, and prayed that they

This chapter was written by Donald G. Mathews, Ph.D., Professor of History, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 153.

might not fall back into sin, Methodists changed their ideas about the world because it was changing too. What had once been a radical renunciation of standards set by people in authority became by the end of the nineteenth century an effort to enforce their own standards as authoritative for society. In the process the Methodists' church became more like the world as the world became more like the church.

One of the most important aspects of the Methodist movement was its appeal to people who were politically powerless and socially demeaned. The point is made so often as to be almost bromidic, but it is nonetheless well worth keeping in mind that in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries when Methodism was growing by great surges, it attracted free and enslaved black people, large numbers of women, and men who were usually in the lower ranks of the "middling" classes: small farmers, artisans, shop keepers and the like. In the New World as in the Old, Methodists referred to themselves as "common people," but they did not believe that their relative poverty was a mark of humiliation so much as of God's grace, consequently making it an outward sign of Christian piety. This view was at odds with that which prevailed in the eighteenth century South where wealth was the measure of personal worth. Based upon the ownership of large holdings of land and slaves, and expressed in a peculiar style of life, wealth set "aristocracy" off from the lower classes. Clothing, recreation, position in public assemblies and aloofness from contact with people of lower ranks reinforced the aristocracy's claims to primacy. Their clothing was designed to call attention to the wearer, and the jewelry, ruffles, and feathers which complemented it enhanced the total effect. Horseracing, gambling, balls, and even private parties indicated that the aristocracy unlike ordinary mortals could explode in elaborate self-expression which was denied the poor and the relatively comfortable middling folk. The sense of distance between classes was reinforced by the established church which set aside privileged areas in which to seat the local elite during worship; and even in polite discourse between the powerful and powerless the church expected no breaching of class barriers, but rather a deferential manner and careful formality to perpetuate the humility of the poor, the pride of the rich.[1]

Against this ordered, balanced world, Methodists launched a broad assault, turning its standards upside down and preaching a Gospel which for all its apolitical character betokened a social revolution. For a Deity removed from the affairs of men, Method-

ists substituted a personal God Who was involved in the history not only of nations but also of specific individuals. For a universe the meaning of which could be discovered only by rational analysis, Methodists substituted a completely different and ultimately personal concern, a profound introspection which cast the world in terms of psychological insight, affective social relations, and a sense of personal worth and dignity. For a society which valued people according to their rank on the scale of wealth and power, Methodists substituted a small, caring group of men and women who quite consciously and specifically rejected social ranking along conventional lines. Moreover, the aristocracy's recreation—racing, gambling, dancing, etc.—was forbidden as trifling and profligate unconcern about one's personal salvation, a flippant attitude to the precious gift of life itself. Attempts to ape the wealthy in dress and habits were condemned as a demonic distortion of one's true duty to follow Christ and His teaching; gold rings and ruffles therefore became marks of misplaced loyalties, personal superficiality, and flawed aspirations.

Although the mood of such restrictions connotes a mild asceticism, the Methodist view of the world was expansive and celebratory when it came to encouraging men and women to see themselves as new people saved from the wrath of God and set on an exciting adventure in Christian living. Each person was addressed as if he or she with God's saving grace could become ultimately more worthwhile than society would ordinarily allow. The key to the new life was not rational analysis—a key very few could fit into the lock—but an intense desire to repudiate one's personal rebellion against God and commit oneself to a life of unremitting service to Christ. This desire would eventually be transformed into a sense of release and rejuvenation which very often was accompanied by emotional trauma and frequently also by uncontrolled motor responses such as groans, tears, and convulsions. Once individuals were freed from believing that they were no more important than social convention said they were, they became part of an increasing resistance to the past. As they committed themselves to the church, they turned their backs on the world (society) which maintained its pecking order by keeping the "better" folk aloof from ordinary people. Indeed, no one could remain aloof from his fellow worshippers in Methodist meetings for there there was very little distance, crowded as people were into small houses and chapels. Physical proximity and the psychic intimacy of confessing one's sins in public was complemented by touching other believers,

especially by offering one's hand in a symbolic expression of personal concern and love. In such a situation one could become less attached to the value placed upon him/her by society and more secure in that confirmed by fellowship in Christ. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Methodist movement should have attracted women and blacks in relatively large numbers, for in the emotional arena of the Methodist meeting they were encouraged to make their own intense desire to become acceptable to God normative for judging themselves; and in doing so, they were attempting to diminish the suffocating impact upon their persons of their subordination to white men. To be sure, their position in society did not change objectively, but the Methodist revivals provided a value system and sense of self-esteem to women and blacks with which to fend off the most horrendous implications of their low estate and powerlessness.

The most stark examples of Methodists' departure from conventional standards were the manner in which they chose their ministers and the character of the abortive attack upon African slavery. The way in which people select their leaders reveals a great deal about them—what they value, how they see themselves, and how they wish others to view them. Traditionally, clergymen had been selected by ecclesiastical bodies who had set up careful procedures for recruiting, educating, and ordaining men for the ministry. In both the Presbyterian and Episcopal (Anglican) churches the emphasis was upon order and education, and although it was not necessary to have received a college degree in order to be ordained, it was indeed necessary to have had some formal training, preferably at a college, and to have satisfied appropriate authorities as to one's knowledge of the original languages (Hebrew and Greek), the Bible, theology, and church history. Higher education, even for people who never received a degree was the special preserve of the privileged classes so that poor boys who were lucky enough to have had a patron to finance formal training became part of a system which in the eighteenth century had a distinct class orientation. An educated clergy was therefore not only a trained clergy, which had studied specifically for its profession, but also a ministry intimately linked to relatively wealthy social groups.

Methodists repudiated this system and argued that the criteria by which to evaluate a clergyman were not formal education and general knowledge, but piety, knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and ability to move people into a conversion experience. This latter ability was the basic requirement for Methodist religious

leadership and represented better than anything else the "radical" character of the Methodist revolution because it defined a new relationship between authority and the people over whom it was exercised. In both church and society traditional belief emphasized that civil and religious law was conveyed from authority to the people. In this the people were theoretically passive recipients who bowed to the statements of their rulers, for it was almost axiomatic that society would be peaceful and harmonious only so long as inherited institutions and deferential behavior held in check the volatile and potentially dangerous emotions of the vast majority. In this mental context Methodist preachers would be understood as being particularly radical and even subversive because they attacked the Church of England, or any church for that matter, which could not satisfy basic emotional and psychic needs; by word and act they repudiated ministers unconcerned with the personal religious life of the masses; by sporadic revivals they unleashed pent-up emotions of thousands who eagerly affirmed themselves in the transports of the conversion experience. And this process was presided over by persons who for the most part had had very little formal education. Thus the Methodist clergy offended conservatives by basing the church upon acts and feelings of the people rather than received tradition, making persons of low estate think more highly of themselves than by traditional criteria they should have, repudiating reason for emotion, and resting their authority upon their rapport with the faithful rather than credentials authenticated by established means.

An even more radical posture was confirmed by the Methodists' attack upon slavery. Influenced by Quaker example and led by their two bishops, Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury, Methodist ministers at the Baltimore Conference of 1784 attempted to fix into the very constitution of the church an antislavery regulation. All Methodists who did not free their slaves within two years were to be expelled! The angry response of an outraged laity forced a hasty retreat. In the spring of 1785 in North Carolina, a conference of preachers joined Bishop Coke and Jesse Lee of Virginia in heated debate about antislavery legislation but the issue was not resolved until late that year when a conference in Baltimore rescinded the offending rule on behalf of the entire church.[2] This action relieved but did not dissipate slaveholders' suspicion of Methodist preachers and their dogged determination to undermine slavery and convert blacks to Christianity; wherever they went they carried a taint of radicalism and elicited suspicions that they were

up to no good. While riding circuit in Bertie county, North Carolina in 1789 James Meacham mused to himself about slavery, "the miserable weight of oppression." "While the proud whites can live in luxury and abomination making a mock of God and his word," he wrote in his journal, "the African upholds him by his sweat and labour of his willing hands—and if they serve the Lord God it must be in the dead of night when they ought to be taking rest to their bodies." But that was mere discomfort compared to what happened to Meacham a few nights later. While preaching to blacks, "filled with the power & spirit of God," a county magistrate broke into his meeting with a group of whites and began to beat members of the congregation. A black man turned to Meacham "with bursting grief, tears of blood rolling down his bruised face, and cryed, 'This is what I have got for praising of my dear Jesus.' "[3]

If Afro-Americans had to suffer for their faith, white Methodists saw no need for themselves to do so. The radical antislavery rules became an example of naive idealism, and although a few persons here and there might resent slaveholders' power and a few Piedmont Methodists might be ready to join an abolitionist church in the late 1850's,[4] white Methodists of North Carolina were for the most part willing to accept slavery as a fact of life about which "nothing could be done." The change from radical denunciation to reluctant acceptance of slavery was understood by the preachers not only as a pragmatic readjustment of goals but also as a means of converting people to Christ. Slaveholders would not submit to antislavery preachers nor allow them access to their slaves. This being the case, the clergy reasoned, the only way to have an impact on either master or slave was to sidestep the issue of slavery and concentrate instead on bringing people regardless of social condition to Christ. There was another reason, too, for changing the rule, one which reflects the social class from which most Methodists came. The rhetoric of Methodism which repudiated an unseemly respect for wealth and the pastimes of the aristocracy and elevated simplicity, piety, and self-discipline was obviously circumscribed by the fact that large numbers of Methodists owned a few slaves. Thus Methodists were presumably exactly what they said they were—members of a class of people who were neither poor nor wealthy. But by the end of the War for Southern Independence it was clear, too, that Methodists had not been content to dominate the lower-middle ranks of society, but desired also to move upward through the social strata. If they never claimed the aristocracy,

Methodists at least believed that they had become an influential group worthy of respect. People with this kind of aspiration could not for long accept rules which prevented their using all the resources at their command to get ahead. Slaves were obviously too important a resource to ignore.

Methodist ministers argued that resources or not, slaves were also human beings who had a claim upon their masters for just treatment and Christian education. The argument that slaveholding had to be accepted so slaves could be converted was not merely a rationalization but also a prescription for action. In parts of North Carolina black people were the solid base upon which Methodism was founded. In Fayetteville, Henry Evans, a black local preacher from Virginia, preached both black and white Methodism into existence in the first decade of the nineteenth century, and in many eastern Carolina circuits and stations, blacks made up the majority of Methodists. For example, at the end of the War for Southern Independence six hundred blacks and two hundred whites were members of Front Street Church in Wilmington. The two races were together in one church here as elsewhere because blacks and whites were supposed to share a common gospel which united them in peace and harmony. This admirable goal could never be reached in the church, however, unless it were first achieved in the home. Slavery, argued an author who circulated widely among literate North Carolina Methodists, is a *domestic* institution, one resting upon familial relationships and government. The master, wrote the President of Randolph-Macon College, has the same responsibilities for his slaves as a father has for his children: to provide them with good physical surroundings and spiritual guidance. To people determined to defend their right to own slaves, he emphasized that that "right" was primarily a responsibility to shape Afro-Americans into good Christians.[5] And Charles Force Deems, a prominent North Carolina Methodist preacher, suggested in a book on family worship that if masters were disappointed with their servants' irresponsible work habits, the fault probably lay with the masters themselves for not personally exemplifying their own ultimate accountability to God. Observing their master's "carelessness," slaves would naturally see no reason why they should act "responsibly" if whites did not. Family worship, Deems promised, would solve the problem by binding the entire household—including slaves—together in common acknowledgement of their accountability to God; the result would be "peace, happiness, and successful labor."[6]

Even with blacks and whites in the same family and church, the ideal of brotherhood in Christ could never breach the determination of whites to keep blacks subject to them. Even after emancipation, whites could not bring themselves to relinquish their control, so ingrained into their very souls had been the ideal of blacks' subordination to whites. Most of the former slaves wished to escape the surveillance of whites, and realizing that Christian brotherhood was impossible with their former masters, left them for their own churches. A case in point was the Front Street Church in Wilmington in 1865. On February 22 Federal troops occupied the city and the black members of the church invited a black chaplain who accompanied the Yankees to address them on their "day of jubilee." In his remarks the chaplain mentioned in passing a characteristic of slave life which indicated the great chasm between black and white Methodists. A fugitive slave from North Carolina himself, he recalled "how we used to have to employ our dark symbols and obscure figures to cover our real meaning." "Amen," shouted the congregation; "Hallelujah! That's so!"[7] Even in the intimacy of the Methodist meeting the candor of Christians with one another had been hedged about by suspicion and doubt.

With emancipation the time of hidden meanings and "obscure figures" was over, as the white pastor of Front Street Church, L. S. Burkhead, discovered to his chagrin. Burkhead watched in pained condescension as his black parishioners celebrated a freedom which he believed they could not comprehend; but he himself was the ignorant one, trying to calm the black members and prevent them from carrying emancipation too far. He simply could not empathize with his black membership, a fact of which they at least were very much aware. When a group of black leaders asked him to share his pulpit with the black chaplain, W. Hunter, he was enraged and insulted at the implications of such an act, blurting out that he would not be driven from his church! Before the points in contention were cleared up, the controversy embroiled the Federal military authorities, two groups of black people, white church members, and the North Carolina annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. Most of the blacks voted to transfer to the African Methodist Episcopal church with which Chaplain Hunter was affiliated, and to take the church building with them since they believed it belonged to them. Although Federal military officers were inclined to believe that the blacks were morally justified in their claim to the church and although there was good reason for the blacks to believe it legitimate, they were eventually driven out.[8]

Ironically the people who had once challenged public opinion by preaching to slaves and bringing them into communion now expressed the views of the "best white people" that if blacks would not submit to white authority they should leave the church. In no other instance was the fusion of Methodist values with those of the world more pronounced than this.

If Methodists changed their attitude on slavery as members acquired slaves—or hoped to—they also changed their attitude on education. Methodists had not elevated their preachers above "educated" clerics of other faiths in order to demean education, but to create a leadership which educated people steadfastly refused to give them. For three generations this leadership traversed the great distances of North Carolina to create an ecclesiastical network to bind Methodists together. It was demanding and lonely work which required Peter Doub, for example, in 1822-3 to take four weeks in keeping each appointment on a circuit which included the counties of Wake, Johnson, Wilson, Wayne, Lenoir and Greene. Doub's career also exemplifies in broad outline the metamorphosis of North Carolina Methodism: in 1821 he presided over a great revival in the Haw River area of the state and in 1867-9 he lectured in Trinity College as Professor of Biblical Literature.[9] The third generation of North Carolina clergy, self-educated themselves, worked hard to give their sons what their fathers before them had been unable to provide. From revival to college, North Carolina Methodism had developed an institutional structure which betokened a significant change from the fluidity and isolation of the early movement to the prestige and influences represented by sponsoring one college for men, three for women, and three academies by 1860.[10] These educational institutions and those which came afterward were symbolic of Methodists' having finally achieved respectability. Once attacking the world for false values spawned by impious, educated elites, Methodists by the 1830's were preparing to create their own educated leadership which, while yielding to none in knowledge, would emboss its learning with piety. Thus North Carolina Methodists helped Virginians to establish Randolph-Macon College in the 1830's and named it for a non-Methodist politician from each state in the hope of attracting support from the "world" as well as the church. Unlike the retreat from antislavery activity, the development of educational institutions was an extension of earlier commitments, for the Methodists built colleges and academies in order to provide education to people who otherwise would not have been able to afford it. If

this admirable achievement meant muting former antagonism to the "world," it had not been so damaging to Christian brotherhood as had the compromise with slavery.

Another significant change within Methodism as well as society was indicated by the gradual demise of two important Methodist institutions, the anxious bench and the class meeting. The anxious bench was an area set apart from the rest of the congregation to which fled persons woefully confessing their sinfulness and earnestly pleading with God to ease their tortured souls by assuring them that they had been forgiven and set on the path to a perfect Christian life. Afflicted by a stern self-reproach which prevented their trusting their own undisciplined emotions, many people needed help to escape from that awful sense of being suspended between Hell and Heaven, not knowing for which they were bound but fearing that they deserved the one even as they desperately wanted the other. Friends and relatives came out of the congregation to pray with the preacher over the often prostrate forms of "anxious sinners" until they were eased gently into a state of peacefulness in which they could acknowledge that God had indeed given assurance of their salvation. The class meeting was in many ways the institutional guarantor of the assurance which anxiety-ridden sinners desired so intensely while at or on the anxious bench. A group of about ten to twenty persons, the class in early Methodism was the place where believers learned about the Gospel while on probation as church members and where they discussed the most intimate details of their religious lives, confessing sins, asking for psychological support, submitting themselves to the discipline of the group and discovering the love and companionship in Christ which bound them to the church. The essential characteristic and concept of the class was "discipline," for under direction of the class leader, the group inquired into the private lives of each member, asking about recent evidence in each person's life of the grace of God, and scrutinizing behavior lest some might have relaxed the constant vigilance to avoid evil and do good which was required of all Methodists. Thus the person who drove his mules for hire on Sunday or she who wore a fringe on her skirt could expect admonition just as could the brawler, the gossip, the frivolous, the drunk.

Although the anxious bench was to persist in revivals and camp meetings, neither it nor the class meeting could survive the century. By the 1850's older Methodist theorists were complaining about the disuse of class meetings and in 1866 the General Conference

of the Methodist Episcopal Church South rescinded the requirement obligating members to attend them because it had long since been abandoned anyway. The generation between 1820 and 1860 could not wholeheartedly support what their fathers and mothers had prized, and their children would not even try. The reasons for the change were as complicated as the reasons which made the class attractive in the first place, and this fact was frustrating and confusing to many people who valued the ever receding and heroic Methodist past. The reluctance to attend class meeting, complained one distressed old man in the middle of the War for Southern Independence, resulted from the sad fact that people were less "self-denying," less "simple-hearted," less "spiritual minded" now (1863) and the strength of the class had been its stern opposition to "worldly pleasures."[11] This person like others before the war[12] believed that the church had in a sense fallen from grace. And the character of that "fall" was revealed in what older people thought their children had lost when they rejected the class: self-discipline, self-examination, the ability to share oneself with other people, the commitment to a religious life which made radical distinctions between believers and "worldlings." There was, lamented a few Jeremiahs, a conflation of "worldly" and Methodist values which diminished religion and that sense of communal identity which once had so invigorated Methodism.

The Wesleyan movement had been built in North Carolina as elsewhere on the strength of the class. It had provided something very important to people in the late years of the eighteenth century and the first generation of the nineteenth—a sense of personal worth and of belonging to a group of people who cared for one another. North Carolina was almost a political fiction during these years, a state to be sure, but not a society. Physical isolation characterized most Carolina settlements, and people had very little sense of being important apart from church or family. The population was volatile, too, in that people were moving in and out of the state on the way to a better future, and the isolation and movement combined to create in relatively unattached people a desire to be part of a group outside the family which could provide definite, unbendable rules to order what was felt to be a very disorderly world. The Methodist class was attractive to people left out of the Baptist revivals and ethnic solidarity of the German sects and Scots-Irish Presbyterians, for it gave them guidance which others already had, telling them how to act, how to relate to each other within as well as without the family and what to do about

trying to become better persons. In search of this latter goal the class probed deep into the psyches of its members and elicited a profound commitment to the values it taught. To isolated settlements and individuals cut loose from old moorings in the current of humanity which surged through the South, the class gave meaning, order, discipline and a sense of personal worth.

When conditions making the class necessary changed, it too changed from a vital group which gave meaning to life into an institutional artifact. North Carolina settlements and people became less isolated as the nineteenth century progressed; Methodists built churches on the bases of their classes and the churches in turn promoted membership in various charitable societies—Bible, missionary, and temperance organizations, for example—which could fulfill many of the functions of the class. At the same time, men were becoming more active in political parties and fraternal orders, discovering new dimensions to social life and detracting from the total control once exercised in class. Even within the church itself, procedures developed which diminished face to face contacts and gave more weight to impersonal factors. To provide a concrete example: once the class had set young men on the path to the ministry. In that intimate group where everyone knew everyone else's personal and private life, hypocrisy was rare because there was simply no place to hide. With such knowledge the class could arrive at a genuine consensus as to who had spiritual gifts, strength of character, presence of mind, and knowledge to deal with all exigencies—mental, moral, devotional, and practical. The process of selection was therefore very personal as through the interaction of the group a young man became aware that he was "called" to preach the word of God. As classes combined to create churches, the responsibility for sponsoring young men became less that of small, intimate groups and more that of churches the members of which would know the person in question less well than the class. The next step was to shift attention from relationship with the quarterly conference of circuit or station to fulfillment of rules established by annual and General conferences. By the end of the antebellum period, intimate class meetings had been supplanted by larger groups and impersonal rules in the recruitment of preachers; and the nurseries of the Methodist ministry became less the class meeting and more the denomination's colleges. Thus formal education and higher professional standards for the clergy combined with the proliferation of activities available to Methodists—some of which could even be justified as "religious"—to subvert the class.

Although the class and anxious bench did not die out completely in nineteenth century North Carolina, their continued shadowy existence as remnants of a lost age acted as a reminder of a basic change in nineteenth century society. When old men observed in sorrow that Methodists were less "self-denying" and "spiritual" in the 1850's than a generation earlier, they meant that the sense of intimate companionship with persons beyond one's family, and perhaps within the family as well, was lost. Not only so, but the self-discipline of Methodists which one distinguished them from the "world" was simply not so effectively taught and enforced as it once was. The tempting, alluring appeal of activities and institutions which did not delve so profoundly into a person's psyche as the class allowed personal "breathing space," and a little more privacy even if at the expense of elevating pleasant superficiality above "serious concerns" of the faith. Relations amongst Methodists, as most people, were becoming less personal, more distant, more a matter of respectable patterns of behavior than of commitment to other people and to Christ. It was almost as if the pious were losing control of their own lives to "worldly" institutions. But if this were indeed the problem—and many Methodists believed it to be—there was of course a solution: the pious could control the "world."

This the Methodists in league with likeminded people in other denominations attempted to do in the temperance and prohibition movement of the late nineteenth century. The character of this movement can best be seen in a statement made by the Methodist Local Ministers' Association for North Carolina in 1891. A "foreign element" which the ministers declined to name was charged with having "brought into our government all those noxious and devilish principles" developed in "densely populated countries" and the "crowded cities" beyond the Atlantic. "Nihilism, atheism, anarchism, and infidelity" had "bloomed forth into the vast reservoirs of alcoholic liquors, controlled and manipulated by the liquor syndicates of North America. These powers *today,* control the legal enactments," they charged, of every level of government in the country and they therefore pled for the election of prohibitionists in every election.[13] By this time, Methodists had been leaders in the prohibition movement for almost a generation. In the decade before the war they had braved charges of Yankee fanaticism to try to control the sale of liquor at the local level, but not until the late 1870's could a campaign to force legislation against the sale of "ardent spirits" be undertaken by church groups.

When the North Carolina Liquor Dealers' Association asked for a reduction of the state tax on liquor, they faced the outraged opposition of both Baptists and Methodists as well as non-sectarian temperance organizations. But the Methodists seem to have been the vanguard of the prohibition movement; in December of 1880 the North Carolina annual conference meeting in Winston called upon the state legislature to withstand the liquor lobby and abolish trade in a commodity which Methodists claimed was responsible for most of the moral and social evil in the state. Despite a defeat of 3 to 1 at the polls in 1881, Methodist prohibitionists refused to concede defeat, and throughout the rest of the century demanded, petitioned, and exhorted legislative action to enforce upon believers and non-believers alike one of the most cherished precepts of Methodism: total abstinence.[14]

Why prohibition should have become an all consuming passion for Methodists is something of a mystery. What is especially curious about this turn of affairs is that large numbers of people whose spiritual forebears had renounced the "world" were in effect asking the "world"—the legislature of all the people of North Carolina including non-believers—to enforce one of the major tenets of Methodist belief. The action is even less consistent with Wesleyan history if one takes into account the plaint of antebellum North Carolina Methodists along with their brethren throughout the South that the church could take no stand on political matters such as slavery and abolition—it was one of the arguments which vindicated southern Methodists when they split from the North in 1844/5.[15] And yet the church was very much involved in politics by the 1890's!

The reasons for this about face may be suggested by examining the local preachers' statement of 1891 (mentioned above) within the context of Methodist ideology and the sense of loss expressed at the demise of such traditional aspects of Methodism as the class meeting. First of all, the local preachers listed the demonic forces threatening society in general and Christians in particular, and each enemy, no matter how vaguely defined, constituted a basic threat to *order*. The words "a foreign element" connoted intrusion by people who did not share "our" unique historical experience with relatively open spaces and sparse population and therefore could not be restrained by the lessons it taught. "Nihilism" meant an attack upon institutional order, "anarchism" the repudiation of government's indispensable restraint of human violence and corruption; "atheism" and "infidelity" rejected God's order according

either to Nature or Revelation. Order confronting disorder was not a new concept for Methodists—that was the way they had thought of the Christian life from the very first. The word, "Method-ist," emphasized the essence of the Wesleyan surge to *discipline* the unruly self. Sin was conceived of as loss of control and yielding to unholy passions. Asceticism was the primary mark of early Methodism: the truly pious did not dance, gamble, wear "fashionable" clothes, or take advantage of new bankruptcy laws in the 1840's. Methodist meetings disciplined members who broke the rules of the church, and most of the miscreants had done disorderly things all the way from fighting, which broke social order, to adultery, which broke matrimonial order. Order, control, restraint and discipline suffused Methodist views of the world so that keeping the sabbath free from all recreation and safe for Christian education, meditation, and exhortation was but one important symbol of Christian order. Total abstinence was another. In a world of accelerating social change in which white Methodists felt that they were less "spiritual" than they had been, that they were less in control of black people than they had been, that they were faced with more powerful and sophisticated enemies than they had been, they counterattacked. The whole gospel became somehow encapsulated into the political drive to use the weapons of the "world" against itself. Unable to withstand social change within their churches, North Carolina Methodists attempted to impose order upon the sources of disorder in a crusade against the one visible sign of the Devil himself. Only when they finally won would they discover their mistake.

By the end of the nineteenth century Methodists had changed their position in North Carolina life remarkably when compared with that of one hundred years before. From claiming a little more than eight thousand members in 1800 they could boast over 140,000 members by the end of the "gay nineties." Once a part of the South Carolina, Holston, and Virginia conferences, most North Carolina Methodists were by 1890 under the jurisdiction of the North Carolina and Western North Carolina conferences; the former had been formed in 1837. Before the war they had developed their own colleges, academies, and periodical, the *North Carolina Christian Advocate;* their ministers were publishing books in New York and Nashville and becoming influential as educators as well as preachers. Revivals which had sporadically swept converts into the Methodist fold during the first quarter-century were becoming stylized, less spontaneous and more seasonal by the last

twenty-five years of the century. These were, however, mere superficial changes when compared to the way in which the traditional conflict between church and society—Christ's people and the "world"—had shaped Methodists' views of themselves and their social and physical environment. Once at odds with the values of predominant social groups, Methodists became with their Baptist and Presbyterian brethren a "Christian public" which exerted impressive political and social influence by the 1890's. The dichotomy of church and world was always difficult to maintain, and by the end of the century the only way Methodists could see any hope of fending off the "blandishments" of the "world" and maintain the disciplined self-restraint required of all believers was to make the "world" more like the church. Ironically Methodism had changed from a movement of upwardly mobile people of modest circumstances into the very bastion of white middle class respectability. In the process the concrete evidence of their impact on society changed from the intimate class meeting which disciplined its members in love to a prohibition movement which aspired to discipline non-members in fear.

CHAPTER SIX

In Slavery's Shadow: North Carolina Methodism and Race Relations, 1885-1920

Ralph E. Luker

In December, 1922, Southern Methodism's most distinguished theologian, Wilbur Fisk Tillett, stood before the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches in Indianapolis, Indiana. He called to the podium a fellow delegate, S. G. Atkins of North Carolina, and greeted him in Wesleyan fraternity: "If thy heart is as my heart, give me thy hand." The cordial greeting exchanged between two sons of North Carolina Methodism would have passed otherwise unnoticed had their fathers not been master and slave.[1] "Your father and mine were both alike willing bondservants of Jesus Christ while here in the flesh," said the slave-master's son to his black brother. "They are together now in a land where both are free, and I can but think that if they look down upon us from the glory land they rejoice to see their sons associated together in the freedom and fellowship . . . of Christian education."[2]

The greeting exchanged between Wilbur Fisk Tillett and S. G. Atkins sixty years after the Emancipation Proclamation came in the wake of an era in which the lingering tensions and affections of the slave system had worked themselves out in new patterns of race relations. Reconstruction had seen the influx of Northern white missionaries determined to absorb the South into Union

Ralph Edlin Luker, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of History at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 153.

Methodism and of black missionaries equally determined to confirm emancipation in racial Methodism.[3] Many Southern black Methodists joined their Northern brothers in the expansion of the African Methodist Episcopal Church and the African Methodist Episcopal Church, Zion, while others became associated with the Methodist Episcopal Church. In order to relieve the strain of race relations within the Southern church and prevent rival Methodisms from sweeping the field, Southern Methodists sanctioned the establishment of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in 1870. For the next decade, the Southern Church concentrated upon resisting the missionary efforts of Northern Methodists among Southern whites and consolidating its hold upon the region. Between 1870 and 1885, white membership in the Southern church leaped from 535,000 to 860,700.[4]

Yet, the growth of Southern white Methodism only slowly mitigated the strain with Northern missionaries in the region. As late as 1890, Thomas N. Joiner, a white Northern Methodist missionary among the North Carolina freedmen, was beaten and driven from the state. Professor J. L. Armstrong of Trinity College explained the mob action by charging that Joiner was, after all, "a rabid negrophilist" who worshipped at the shrine of social equality and was said even to have adopted mulatto children. Joiner's preaching, Armstrong charged, "has a very bad effect upon the inflammable darky; it tends to set him above work, to make him more insolent, and, in those countries [sic] where the negro population is large, it excites him to dangerous outbreaks."[5]

At the same time, the dramatic growth of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was only one measure of the self-confident strength of the New South. Indeed, Southern churchmen came to believe increasingly that, in retrospect, the abolition of slavery had been an unmixed blessing for the white community. "It is the white man of the South more than the black that has been freed by the civil war," said Wilbur Fisk Tillett,

> and the greatest blessing which has thus far resulted to the South from the emancipation of the Southern slaves is its effect upon the white man of that region in transforming him from a dependent idler . . ., supported by his slaves, into an independent, self-reliant worker.

By contrast, he concluded, the Negroes had "thus far as a rule worked no more and no better since their freedom than before."[6]

Tillett's indifferent judgment, however, scarcely reflected the growing anxiety about conditions of life among the freedmen among Southern white churchmen. Not only were the freedmen

seen as unproductive, but the white religious leaders thought that they were slipping away from the orderly life and elements of civilization in which they had been tutored under slavery. Since emancipation the freedman had fallen back upon his own resources or under misguiding influences, they believed; in either case, the result was disastrous. "Always and everywhere," wrote Kentucky's Charles W. Miller, "the hour the Negro is thrown back upon his own resources they fail him, and he begins a retrograde movement which seems to be as inexorable as fate." "Daily and hourly," cried Georgia's Atticus G. Haygood, "the worst people are teaching him the whole curriculum of the grog shop, the gambling hall, the corrupt ballot, and all the other 'mysteries of iniquity!' "[7] These assessments of the freedmen's condition by Miller and Haygood reflect the *common ground* upon which Southern white churchmen stood in the 1880's. They divided on the appropriate response to that condition. Believing that Southern churchmen had more than fulfilled their obligations to the freedmen, Miller spoke for a tradition of anti-missionary separatism in the Southern church, while Haygood played the refrain of missionary paternalism.[8]

The discussion grew into a debate, with partisans of each position rallying to the cause. Haygood drew to his side some outstanding lieutenants. Oscar P. Fitzgerald, Charles B. Galloway and Wilbur Fisk Tillett pleaded for a recollection of ante-bellum missions to slaves and a return to the historic task of Southern white Christendom.[9] On the other side, Alabama's J. W. Rush and Mississippi's W. L. C. Hunnicutt joined Miller in an attack upon Haygood's "Yankee fanaticism."[10] In North Carolina, Goldsboro pastor R. C. Beaman took up Haygood's plea in typical fashion. Reviewing the history of ante-bellum missions to slaves, Beaman paid tribute to "many of our noblest and most heroic spirits—names that are immortal in the annals of Southern Methodism" who carried on that work. Did emancipation, asked Beaman then rhetorically, relieve their heirs of any further responsibility? No, he insisted, "multiplied thousands of the sons of Ham in our very midst . . . are left to grope their way into the kingdom of God" and "as regards the evangelization of the negroes of the South, the church needs a conscience."[11] But just as Haygood was challenged by Charles Miller, so too was Beaman challenged by a fellow clergyman. "Let them alone. Hands off, hands off," cried the Reverend Mr. Lea. "Don't intrude or obtrude. Any effort on our part in missionary work will not be acceptable . . . and [will] more than likely be resented."[12]

If North Carolina's white Methodists were divided over the obligations of missionary education, few still held to colonization as a way of resolving America's racial problem. In 1894, the editor of the state's *Christian Advocate* bade goodbye to twenty Negroes emigrating to Africa with the assurance that ". . . this entire affair of the negro is of providential direction, the outcome of which is to be the redemption of Africa by its own sons." Yet, within a year, he reported that emigrants were suffering from indifference, unemployment and starvation.[13] Thereafter, the only significant advocate of colonization in North Carolina Methodism was Statesville's John F. Ford. The son of an eastern North Carolina slave-owner, Ford had advocated emigration as early as 1876 because he was convinced that the two races could not live together in peace under the conditions of freedom. God, in His providential wisdom had allowed black men to live for a time in slavery, Ford believed, but now they were called to a providential mission to redeem Africa. The task of the Church was to cooperate in the implementation of that mission.[14]

But by the mid-1890's, it was neither missionary-education nor colonization which commanded the attention of North Carolina's white Methodists. Inter-racial violence, evident then in charges and counter-charges of black rape and white lynching, drove other issues from the forefront. Initially, the *North Carolina Christian Advocate* attempted to sustain an even-handed administration of justice against the impassioned excesses of the lynch-mob.[15] Especially was the *Advocate* critical of the cooperation of public officials in fanning the fires of the mob's blood-thirsty lust for revenge. In July, 1895, for example, Rowan County officials scheduled a public hanging for Whit Ferrand and Anderson Brown, two Negroes convicted of murder. As the day of execution approached, excitement spread throughout neighboring counties. Promoters of its commercial opportunities planned a festive event, featuring foot-races and a baseball game. Eventually, some 10,000 people gathered at Salisbury to witness the death of the two men and celebrate the "gala day." The event was a "calamity," said the *Advocate;* "Shame, shame," echoed a correspondent.[16]

In seeking the causes of the sexual assaults and lawless violence, the *Advocate* originally located them in a new licentiousness which debases female innocence in dance, theatricals, nudity and sensational journalism. "Imprisoning or hanging the brutes who commit these crimes is like removing a pimple when the blood is thick with corruption," said the *Advocate.* "The way to avoid the cause

is to remove the consequence."[17] Later, suspicions of environmental conditioning gave way to bitterness and to suspicions of racial conspiracy and biological degeneracy. The new tones of bitterness were first evident in disparaging remarks about Northern missionary education efforts as a mitigating influence. The Northern brethren, said the *Advocate's* editor,

> seem to think that the salvation of the African in the South depends entirely upon their efforts. Perhaps they could get some of them to move up and live among them. Then they would have a better opportunity for educating these Afro-Americans.[18]

That rape had become "in the strict sense epidemic," said the *Advocate,* was "one of the saddest facts of our civilization."

> We are inclined to think that there has been for the last year or two a secret, insidious propagandism among the colored people which has fanned the flame of racial animosity, and made possible and . . . inevitable this carnival of crime. While we stand almost horror-stricken in the presence of the evil, and our hearts bleed for the innocent victims, yet we cannot give our consent to mob-law, but insist that the law must be supreme.[19]

If the charge of racial conspiracy was insidious enough in its implications, that of biological degeneracy was much more so. In 1897, the Reverend E. A. Yates took up and endorsed such charges, originally made by J. F. Miller, Superintendent of the Eastern Hospital for the "colored insane" at Goldsboro. In a paper delivered before the Southern Medico-Psychological Association meeting at Asheville in September, 1896, Miller had argued that prior to emancipation insanity was practically unknown among the black population, but that since then "the negro has degenerated at a fearful pace . . . and cases of insanity requiring hospital treatment are [now] largely in excess of the whites." Miller was, Yates testified, a "Christian gentleman of high standing and character," ranking among the ablest physicians in the state. The clear implication of his argument was that black men were constitutionally unfit to meet the challenges of freedom.[20]

Given the inclination to believe that blacks were constitutionally unfit for the condition of freedom, to say nothing of participation in the electoral process, it is no wonder then that the advocate of North Carolina's white Methodists endorsed the outcome of the riot which overturned Republican rule in Wilmington in 1898 and the state-wide white supremacy campaign in 1900. When 600 armed whites roamed through Wilmington, burning a black newspaper office to the ground, killing ten to twelve Negroes, and jailed or drove off other black and white Republicans, the *Advocate*

calmly endorsed the results. "It was an uprising against a condition which was considered intolerable, and which cannot exist in Anglo-Saxon government," said the editor. ". . . we will not criticize. We will thank God that it is no worse and thank him that the vexing problem has been solved. . . ." Two years later, when red shirted vigilantes intimidated thousands of black voters, and Democrats forced the adoption of a constitutional amendment disfranchising illiterates, the *Advocate's* editor must have smiled as he wrote: "An unusually heavy white vote was cast. For some reason many colored men did not register or go to the polls."[21]

North Carolina Methodists celebrated the new dispensation in race relations, now confirmed by the success of the white supremacy campaigns, with the publication of a few lines by Rudyard Kipling:

> Take up the White Man's burden—
> Send forth the best ye breed—
> Go, bind your sons to exile
> To serve your captive's need;
> To wait, in heavy harness,
> On fluttered folk and wild—
> Your new-caught sullen peoples,
> Half devil and half child.[22]

The new order was based upon the assumption of white supremacy and non-intervention by Northern forces in the South. These assumptions were embodied in the Southern Education Movement which the North Carolina Methodists supported. In return for black and Northern acceptance of white Southern hegemony in race relations, the churchmen assumed the responsibility of seeing that the state's black population was not further reduced in status. ". . . any effort to readjust laws which have resulted from radical legislation will develop extremists who would rush into revolution rather than reasonable reform," noted the *Christian Advocate.*

> So it turns out that the efforts of the Southern States to rid themselves of the constant menace of ignorant negro suffrage, has brought to the surface a radical element who are ready to fly to the extreme of practically depriving the negro of anything like adequate educational opportunities. Blind and unreasonable racial prejudice disqualifies them for discerning the far-reaching economic questions involved, to say nothing of the higher consideration of the moral obligation on the part of the white race to the weaker and more dependent race.[23]

In the new dispensation, reports of lynching no longer called forth speculation about racial conspiracy and suggestions of biological degeneracy. No longer was the focus upon the charge of rape; now, lynching was due to hot-blooded passions aroused by

strong drink.[24] Beyond the appeal for Christianizing influences upon the Negroes to encourage self-restraint and self-support, North Carolina's Methodists advocated a broader sense of social responsibility in the whole community. Public officers would have to pass and enforce stringent legislation, editors would have to attack violence in all forms and preachers "will have to declare from the pulpit the whole command of God against all evil doers."[25] Indeed, the new order in race relations provided a security within which the rather conservative *Christian Advocate* could make judgments which otherwise sounded quite radical. "Justice should be swift and unerring; but the delay of the law is not responsible for mob law," said the journal editor.

> Who are the lynched? The rich or the poor? For whom does the law delay justice? The rich or the poor? The answer to these questions should settle the matter. If the mob only settled matters when the law failed to do so, or it was likely to do so, it would be bad enough, but the mob is a respecter of persons; and the rich and the honorable are exempt from its jurisdiction.[26]

The spirit of the new age in North Carolina's race relations was measured not only in lynchings but in the furious reaction to the missionary paternalism of John Spencer Bassett. Ten years earlier, North Carolina Methodists could calmly debate the claims of a continuing obligation to the black community. In the new order, such assertions evoked the most serious challenge to freedom of speech in the history of North Carolina Methodism.

John Spencer Bassett was a native North Carolinian, a Methodist layman and an alumnus of Trinity College. After completing doctoral work in history at Johns Hopkins University, Bassett returned to his alma mater where he plunged into an energetic round of teaching, research and editing. His early research interest in North Carolina slavery produced three monographs on the subject and, by 1900, he planned a larger history of black Americans.[27] In that year, he published "North Carolina Methodism and Slavery," a paper which reiterated themes sounded earlier by Atticus Haygood and Goldsboro pastor R. C. Beaman, among others. Commending the church for its antebellum missions to slaves, Bassett nonetheless charged that it had failed to live up to its responsibilities in the years since emancipation. "The black man is our brother and will remain so," he said. "To him our church has a duty. Does it perform it by letting him alone?"[28] Two years later, he founded the *South Atlantic Quarterly,* which he edited until 1905. During those years, Bassett published three of

his own articles on the race question. He had often expressed in private correspondence his disgust with the trend of North Carolina race relations from the Wilmington riots through the white supremacy campaign of 1900 and he joined with Trinity's president, John C. Kilgo, in forthright condemnation of lynching.[29] But in October, 1903, Bassett published an article which drew all the ire of the white extremists down upon him. In "Stirring up the Fires of Race Hatred," he attacked the political exploitation of racial hostility and reasserted the liberal value of equality of opportunity even for black people. "The 'place' of every man in our American life is such as his virtues and capacities may enable him to take," Bassett argued. "Not even a black skin and a flat nose can justify caste in this country."[30]

The article aroused a furious response from Josephus Daniels, editor of the Raleigh *News and Observer,* and Furnifold M. Simmons, boss of the state's Democrat machine. The *News and Observer* led the state's press in an attack on the man they called "bASSett." Only the Charlotte *Observer,* the *Progressive Farmer,* the *Biblical Recorder* and the *North Carolina Christian Advocate* refrained from joining the assault.[31] Within the Trinity College Board of Trustees, Simmons was joined by five clergymen and a businessman in voting for Bassett's ouster. Yet, in pleading the case for the history professor's retention, President Kilgo held letters of resignation from himself and the remainder of the faculty in the event he lost the case. More importantly, he had the support of Benjamin Duke, four clergymen and the Methodist laymen on the Board. The vote stood 18 to 7 to retain Professor Bassett.[32]

While H. M. Blair, the editor of the *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* felt that Bassett had been unwise and might have voluntarily resigned, he nevertheless supported the action of the Trustees. The task at hand, he reminded his readers, was to preach the gospel and spread scriptural holiness over the land. "If we suspend our chief work at every cry of the agitator, we shall be sure to find our forces demoralized and Satan making havoc of the rank and file."[33] Thus, even in the face of bitter racial animosities, the *Christian Advocate* continued to appeal to the values of missionary paternalism. ". . . all thoughtful people know that there has been an ever-widening gulf between the negro race and the white preacher in the South since the war," lamented the editor.

> While it is true that, in the time of slavery, the Southern Methodist preacher was perhaps the greatest factor in molding the character of the negro, and that the race made substantial progress in moral and religious character,

> he has been effectually estopped from all opportunity to render service to the race since the war closed.

Nevertheless, the effort had to be made, insisted the *Advocate*. "Every preacher in the South should devote at least a portion of his time to the help of the 'brother in black,' and the closest feeling of fraternity should exist between the ministers of both races. Otherwise, there is little hope of a solution of the race problem," concluded the journal.

> At the foot of the cross there will be found out a method of harmonizing all nations and kindreds and people. They can be harmonized nowhere else. So, without compromising our position as the social superior of the negro, it is, nevertheless, high time for us to realize our providential mission to him and have the courage to brook a senseless sentiment which bids us keep hands off and leave him to himself.[34]

Conservative support of the new order in race relations drew official praise of the "providential" leadership of Booker T. Washington as "a Moses for his race." At the same time, it led to cautious criticism of the extremist attitudes found in *The Clansman* and *The Leopard's Spots,* novels by North Carolinian Thomas Dixon. "Perhaps Mr. Dixon has erred quite as much in one direction as Harriet Beecher Stowe did in the other," said H. M. Blair. "A great social problem on our hands cannot be wisely solved by setting on fire the passions and prejudices of the people."[35]

Increasingly, however, North Carolina's Methodist spokesmen were appalled by the growing evidence of violence in the state. In July, 1906, the town hall at Kernersville was dynamited. "This is the very root and essence of the Nihilist," said the *Christian Advocate*. ". . . this case in Kernersville is but the picket firing of the advance guard of a great company who are at no distant day to cry, 'Down with municipal authority! Down with all civil law and authority!' " After the Kernersville mob, North Carolinians could no longer comfort themselves with the assurance that anarchy was a foreign import. "They were born and bred in the little village doubtless—and the same thing we fear is true in almost every community. The real source of our trouble is in the Christless homes of so many of our people."[36]

Within two weeks, a group of Negroes broke into the home of Isaac Lyerly, a prominent white man in Rowan County. Killing Lyerly, his wife, a son and a daughter, the assassins doused the beds with kerosene and set fire to the bloody scene. "Such outbreaks of savagery are extremely disquieting and the people throughout the country should take warning." Lynchings were only narrowly

averted when a half-dozen black men were arrested on suspicion, but a month later, in the midst of their trial, three of the defendants were seized and put to death. The *Christian Advocate* reported that at least one of the victims was thought to have been innocent, but held that these reports were beside the point. "The supreme objection to the mob," said the journal's editor, "is that it is a law-defying and God-defying aggregation of depraved humanity; hostile to the precious institutions of civil and religious liberty and ready, on slight provocation, to take the lives and destroy the property of the very best citizens of the state." In fact, however, the *Advocate* was suspiciously interested in discounting rumors that leading citizens in Rowan County had taken part in the lynch mob and held that public sentiment in the South was firming up against mob action.[37]

Yet, a month later, race riots swept through Atlanta, confirming the *Advocate's* suspicion that "in the South, the reign of the mob is on the increase, and not on the decrease. Something must be done," said the editor, "for the life of our civilization is at stake." Assessing the situation two weeks later, the journal held that it had lessons to teach all sides. The black community must turn its attention toward "the suppression of the unnameable crime of the race." In turn, the white community must suppress inflammatory rhetoric. "That form of political faith that depends for life upon stirring up race hatred should be retired forever in the South," insisted the *Advocate,* "and the Clansman and all such stage performances as are calculated to stir up race feeling should be absolutely prohibited."[38]

At the same time, the North Carolina editor noted that the Atlanta riots had "called forth much discussion which will do good." Initially, the most promising of these discussions began at the instigation of former Georgia Governor William J. Northen, a prominent Baptist layman. Basing his appeal upon the duty of a Christian citizen, Northen stressed the necessity of white leadership taking the initiative to seek out prominent Negro leaders and seeking "to reach the most equitable and just adjustment possible for the best interests of the two." Northen toured the state, speaking in behalf of his program of inter-racial cooperation.[39]

Yet, it was not the Georgia Baptist, but an adopted son of North Carolina, a Methodist lay-preacher, who pursued the idea of inter-racial cooperation until it became the norm for Southern racial reformers. Although early mixing it with appeals to the tradition of missionary paternalism, Willis Duke Weatherford

preached inter-racial cooperation until it found institutional form in the Commission on Inter-racial Cooperation. Weatherford was born in 1875 to a farm family of Scotch-Irish descent who had moved to Weatherford, Texas, from the mountains of Western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee. He graduated from Weatherford College in 1895 and went to Vanderbilt University in 1897. After first considering a ministerial career, Weatherford took a doctorate in literature and became International Student Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association for Colleges of the South and Southwest.[40]

In April, 1908, Weatherford met in Atlanta with six other associates in Y.M.C.A. work: Walter R. Lambeth, Missionary Secretary of the Southern Methodists and Dr. Stewart R. Roberts, a professor at the Atlanta School of Physicians and Surgeons, both white; and four black leaders, Dr. John Hope of Atlanta Baptist College, Professor John Wesley Gilbert of Paine College, William A. Hunton and Jesse E. Moorland, secretaries of the "Colored Department" of the International Y.M.C.A. The seven quickly agreed with Northen's earlier proposal that leaders of both races must cooperate to improve race relations and, toward the end of preparing an informed leadership, Weatherford agreed to write *Negro Life in the South,* which was adopted as a text by study groups all over the South.[41]

That Weatherford was another in the line of post-Emancipation missionary paternalists, a line that included Atticus G. Haygood and Oscar P. Fitzgerald, R. C. Beaman and John Spencer Bassett, was evident in his second book on race relations, published in 1912. He pointed out that while the Southern Methodists had appropriated $86,000 and appointed 327 missionaries to slaves in 1860, by 1912 they were contributing only $15,000 to the cause and had virtually no representatives in the field. Like Haygood, he appealed for Northern and Southern churches to cooperate in an effort to "lift the Negro from his poverty, ignorance, and sin into a growing knowledge of God, within the next two generations."[42]

Through the second decade of the twentieth century, Weatherford worked through the agencies of the Southern Sociological Congress to win inter-racial cooperation. He encouraged inter-racial contact between leaders, especially in Atlanta and Nashville. He organized conferences on race relations when the end of World War I brought a new crisis and, in 1919, he led in the formation of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, the fore-runner of the Southern Regional Council.[43]

The organization of Southern reformers of both races obviously did not "solve" the region's peculiar problem at the end of World War I. Indeed, the South had stepped backward in race relations between 1885 and 1920. The heavy migration of blacks out of the region and the sanctioning of segregation in other parts of the country and at the highest levels of government had, moreover, vastly complicated the matter. The appeal to missionary paternalism seemed no longer relevant.

Two students of race relations in these years conclude their studies in remarkably similar ways. "When the twentieth century dawned, white churchmen of the South had largely lost ecclesiastical contact with their 'brother in black,' " says H. Shelton Smith. "They were enslaved to the traditional spirit of color caste, and there was little prospect of their emancipation in the foreseeable future." Picking up where Smith left off, John O. Fish writes that "throughout the Progressive Era, Southern Methodists were able to deal with the Negro through a Christian love that allowed distinctions to be made between a 'black brother in Christ' and a 'white brother in Christ.' "[44] Their judgment is no doubt correct, but in celebrating the memory of Southern liberal dissenters in race relations, such as Haygood, Bassett and the early Weatherford, these historians fail to note how poorly the liberals had been served by their appeals to what they judged to be the best in the Southern traditions in race relations. Not only had the Southern church failed to live up to the tradition of missionary paternalism, as the liberals repeatedly pointed out, but, more importantly, the model itself was badly flawed. Repeated appeals to a tradition of "missions to slaves" re-affirmed the former relationship of superior to inferior. At least in their new language of "inter-racial cooperation," Southern liberals sought a new model for race relations. From the end of World War I, they would struggle with its meaning. We are still struggling.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Black Methodists in North Carolina

Joseph B. Bethea

For the most part, black Methodists in North Carolina have their membership in four denominations, each of which is Wesleyan in tradition, doctrine, polity and practice. The African Methodist Episcopal Church, The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church and the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church are denominations whose organizations, administrations and programs are controlled by black people. Black United Methodists still hope and work for an inclusive Christian fellowship in a predominantly white church.

The overwhelming majority of black Methodists in North Carolina are not celebrating the Bicentennial of the Carolina Circuit. Other dates and events more relevant to their history will be remembered by the Methodists who have been and are oppressed by those who celebrate this event.

This chapter is offered because blacks, like whites, were Methodists before the Carolina Circuit was established and have made significant contributions to the life of the church in this state. No more should this religious heritage be ignored. It may be the saving remnant for a church and state which in 1976 proclaim but deny freedom. The aim here is simply to introduce the reader to the black experience in the church with specific reference to the founding of the three denominations and their work in North Carolina. Reference will also be made to the black United Methodists now in the Conferences which celebrate the Bicentennial of the Carolina Circuit.

This chapter was prepared by Joseph B. Bethea, D.D., Director of Black Church Studies, The Divinity School, Duke University.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 157.

I

Since 1758 when John Wesley baptized two blacks' and 1766 when a black woman participated in the organization of the first society in the United States, black people have been a part of the Methodist fellowship. We were one-fifth of the membership in 1799 and almost one-fourth by 1816. In the early years, the majority membership of some societies was black. It is no wonder that at times and in some places, the Methodist Episcopal Church was called "the niggers' church." Its relevance to the condition of oppressed people and its early witness against slavery won for it a tremendous response as blacks sought personhood in this country. Nor dare we overlook the leadership and service of black preachers in the formative years. Harry Hoosier was the body servant and traveling companion of Asbury, Coke, Whatcoat and Garretson.[2] Richard Allen and James Varick were licensed preachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church and leaders of "The Black Church Freedom Movement" which Gayraud Wilmore calls "the beginning of the Black Revolution."[3] Henry Evans was the father of all Methodism in Fayetteville and in much of North Carolina.[4]

Hoosier and Allen attended the Christmas Conference and heard the debate on Slavery. Marcia Mathews describes the debate and records the outcome:

> It was ordered that no person holding slaves should be admitted to the Society or to the Lord's Supper until he had complied with the rules about slavery. The rules were that slaves were to be freed, the older ones immediately, the younger ones when they were twenty-five, and babies at birth.[5]

Mathews also describes how quickly racism gripped the Church so that by 1787 it could be said:

> John Wesley had built a church, but the walls he raised had shut out love.[6]

As the Methodist Episcopal Church relaxed its anti-slavery position and yielded more and more to white racism, the emergence of black Methodist denominations was inevitable.

II

The African Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in 1816. It had been in Richard Allen's heart for a number of years, but his earliest proposals for a separate place of worship for black people were rejected. Primitive Methodism insisted that blacks and whites worship in the same place and always under control of white pastors. Sometime the races were segregated in one service,

sometime separate services were held, but they were clearly racist. An incident at St. George's Church in Philadelphia in 1787 was the catalyst of this Allen-led separation. Allen describes the incident in his book, asserting:

> . . . we all went out of the church in a body, and they were no more plagued with us in the church. . . . we had subscribed largely towards finishing St. George's church, in building the gallery and laying new floors, and just as the house was made comfortable, we were turned out from enjoying the comforts of worshipping therein. We then hired a store-room, and held worship by ourselves. . . .[7]

In 1793, Allen and his associates built a church building which Bishop Asbury consecrated "Bethel" in July, 1794. The church was incorporated under the Methodist Conference and white ministers were its pastors for a time. Problems of property rights, ministerial support, the authority to hold services and the like led to a lawsuit out of which Bethel Church won its independence. Again Allen wrote:

> Many of the colored people in other places were in a situation nearly like those of Philadelphia and Baltimore, which induced us, in April 1816 to call a general meeting, by way of Conference. Delegates from Baltimore and other places which met those of Philadelphia, and taking into consideration their grievances, and in order to secure the privileges, promote union and harmony among themselves, it was resolved: "That the people of Philadelphia, Baltimore, etc., should become one body, under the name of the African Methodist Episcopal Church."[8]

And they did. Allen, who had been ordained by Bishop Asbury, was elected Bishop. Today the A.M.E. Church has approximately 1,250,000 members in approximately 6,000 churches.

It was only after emancipation that black denominations could work effectively with black people in the South. An A.M.E. Church had been established earlier in Charleston, but it was suppressed as were all black assemblies following the Denmark Vesey insurrection there. But when the institution of slavery was abolished, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church engaged in fierce competition to win the freedmen, many of whom had been members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

In 1863, Bishop Daniel A. Payne sent two missionaries to South Carolina.[9] Bishop Payne himself, who had fled from Charleston in 1835 because of the illegality of his efforts to educate slaves there, returned to Charleston to preside over the first session of the South Carolina Conference of the A.M.E. Church on May 15, 1865. He wrote:

> Thirty years from the day I left Charleston, at almost the same day and hour, I returned with a band of traveling preachers to commence missionary operations in Charleston and elsewhere. With these preachers from the North, and some from my native State, I organized the first South Carolina Annual Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.
>
> That one has multiplied into eleven, scattered over the States of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida and Virginia.[10]

The First Session of the South Carolina Conference assigned pastors to Wilmington and Raleigh, North Carolina. The 1866 Session appointed pastors to Wilmington, Raleigh and Newbern. The 1867 Session constituted two districts in North Carolina and made appointments to Raleigh, Greensboro, Center, Trinity, Smithfield, Hillsboro, Piney Grove, Warrenton, Salisbury, Charlotte, Wilmington, Brunswick, Halifax, Newbern, Rocky Point, Bladen County, Fayetteville and Warren.[11]

In his brief historical sketch of the North Carolina Conference for the *Centennial Encyclopedia of the African Methodist Episcopal Church,* J. A. Smith indicated that the Conference "was organized in Wilmington in 1868 by Bishops Payne and Shorter. . . . The growth of the . . . Conference was so marvelous until in November 19, 1892, it became necessary to organize the Western North Carolina Annual Conference."[12] The 1972 *Discipline* of the church lists the two conferences and their boundaries:

> The North Carolina Conference includes that part of the State eastern boundary line of the counties of Vance, Franklin, Wake, and the southeastern line of Chatham, Moore and Scotland Counties. . . .
>
> The Western North Carolina Conference includes that part of the State not included in the description of the North Carolina Conference.[13]

Allen, Payne and Henry McNeil Turner have been called "three of the epochal figures of the A.M.E. Church." Allen led the movement to establish the denomination. Payne and Turner led the denomination's expansion into the South. A comparison of the lives and works of these giants of African Methodism was written by Alain Rogers in an article for *The Black Church Quarterly Journal of the Black Ecumenical Commission of Massachusetts.*[14]

III

The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church was organized in 1820. Again it was black rebellion against white racism in the church. Bishop William Jacob Walls and other historians of the Church insist that Zion was founded in 1796 when James Varick and some other black leaders of John Street Church became dissatisfied with the humiliation, inequality and dehumanization they

were experiencing in the Church. They secured permission from Bishop Asbury to hold their own meetings which for a time they did in the home of Varick. In October, 1796 they rented a house on Cross Street and held their meetings there until they moved into a new church building on Sunday, September 7, 1800. In 1801, their charter as "The African Methodist Episcopal Church of the City of New York, in the State of New York" was recorded. While it provided that "none but Africans or their descendants shall be chosen as Trustees," it also provided that "the elder of the Methodist Episcopal Church . . . shall have direction and management of the spiritual concerns of the Zion Church, or any other church or churches which may or shall be built here after by the Corporation" and that "the said elder may claim for himself and his white brethren, and shall have and possess, a right to preach once on every Sunday, and once during the course of the week . . . in any or all of the houses set apart and built, or to be set apart and built . . ." In 1814, some members of Zion, led by William Miller, chartered African Asbury Church which, in 1816, was placed in a circuit with Zion. These two black churches struggled under the provisions of the original charter until 1820 when Zion withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church.[15]

Bishop Walls details the conflicts and solutions of the formative years—the difficulty in securing the charter; the suspicion raised by the Gabriel Prosser revolt in Virginia; the problem of organizing; the writing of a discipline; negotiations with the Mother Church; and the problems of ordination. But Zion was established as an independent black denomination in 1820. In the Founders' Address, Varick, Miller, and Abraham Thompson wrote:

> . . . so long as we remain in that situation our Preachers would never be able to enjoy these privileges which the Discipline of the white Church holds out to all its Members that are called to preach, in consequence of the limited access our brethren had to those privileges, and particularly in consequence of the difference of color . . .
>
> And whereas, Almighty God, in His all-wise and gracious providence, has recently offered a favorable opportunity, whereby these Societies may be regularly organized as an evangelical African Methodist Church, we have therefore resolved to embrace the said opportunity, and have agreed that the title of the Connection shall be the African Methodist Episcopal Church in America; and we have selected a form of Discipline, with a little alteration of our Mother Church . . .[16]

When the church was organized, there was not an elder in the Connection and Varick was elected "President." After almost two years of negotiations, Varick, Thompson and Leven Smith were

ordained "Elders in the Church of God" by "three regularly ordained Methodist elders." And in July, 1822, James Varick was elected first Bishop of the A.M.E. Zion Church.[17] Today the denomination has approximately 1,100,000 members in approximately 4,600 churches.

Regarding the name, Bishop Walls wrote:

> The first church organized in 1796 and built in 1800 was Zion. The founders chose this name because "it is the name most frequently used in the Bible to designate the Church of God . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . Because another organization came into existence around the same time, with the same title, and much confusion was brought about, the General Conference of 1848 voted to make Zion a part of the denominational name, henceforth to be known as "The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church."[18]

Notice must be taken of the leadership which the people of Zion have given to the struggle of black people for freedom and liberation. In addition to Varick and his associates, Walls cites Frederick Douglas, Sojourner Truth, Harriett Tubman, Jermain W. Loguen, William Howard Day, Joseph P. Thompson, Eliza Ann Gardner, and Catherine Harris as "freedom lights" who "lived and died through all their works in the A.M.E. Zion Church."[19]

The North Carolina Conference of the A.M.E. Zion Church was organized on December 17, 1864. It was organized by Bishop Joseph Jackson Clinton who, in 1863, had selected and sent J. W. Hood to be the first Zion missionary to the South. The Civil War and emancipation had left black members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South confused about their status and their future. Such was the situation when Hood arrived in New Bern on January 20, 1864. Immediately a contest developed between the two black Methodist denominations and the Methodist Episcopal Church to win the congregation known as Andrew Chapel.[20] It was no contest. By authority granted by the Secretary of War, the congregation was permitted to select its pastor. On Easter Sunday the unanimous decision was made "to unite with Zion Connection and to accept the minister who had been sent to them."[21]

Zion's victory in New Bern and its strength in North Carolina might be attributed to the ability of the church and its leaders to identify with the people. Hood wrote:

> In May, 1864, Bishop Clinton arrived in New Berne. Great was the joy of the people at being permitted to see a bishop of their own race, and especially a bishop who was willing to become all things to all men, that he might by all means gain some. Bishop Clinton had no hidebound

notions; whatever was necessary for the success of the Church he was ready to do. At his suggestion several persons were licensed to preach, most of whom made successful preachers.[22]

A number of other churches joined the denomination as did Andrew Chapel. With 12 ministers and about 400 members, the North Carolina Conference was organized. If St. Peter's Church (formerly Andrew Chapel) is "The Mother Church of Zion Methodism in the South, North Carolina is the Mother Conference of Zion Methodism in the South." Almost every conference in the region has been touched by the influence of this conference. In North Carolina alone, which has more Zion Methodists than any other state, there are seven Annual Conferences. They are the North Carolina, the Central North Carolina, the Blue Ridge, the West Central North Carolina, the Western North Carolina, the Albemarle and the Cape Fear. Five of the denomination's twelve Episcopal Districts have territory in North Carolina.

Among the outstanding leaders of Zion who, with Clinton and Hood, planted the church in North Carolina were Andrew Cartwright, E. H. Hill, William J. Moore and J. C. Price. Hood was the first black Assistant Superintendent of Education in North Carolina and was, with Price, co-founder of Livingstone College in Salisbury.[23]

William Jacob Walls was elected to the episcopacy in 1924. After serving in this office for 44 years, he was retired in 1968 and commissioned Historiographer of the Connection. His comprehensive work, published in 1974, is *The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church: Reality of the Black Church.*[24]

IV

It was the continuing issue of slavery that divided the Methodist Episcopal Church at its General Conference in 1844, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South was organized in 1846.* Even so, the Church, South worked hard among black people and by

*Editor's note: Two dates for the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South appear in this paper. Since one is in a quotation, Joseph Bethea has not contradicted himself. The reader is reminded that the Church, South was declared independent of the Methodist Episcopal Church and was proclaimed a separate ecclesiastical connection at the Convention of Delegates from Conferences in Slave-holding States assembled in Louisville, Kentucky in May, 1845. Joshua Soule, however, considered the first General Conference of the Church, South which was held in May of 1846 the consummation of the organization of that Church, and, indeed, the Church was not fully organized until that time.

1860, there were more than 200,000 black members in the church. As we have seen, emancipation left these Methodist freedmen in confusion; some joined one of the two black Methodist denominations; others joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, other denominations or no church at all. In any event, it is said that by 1866 black membership in the Church, South was less than 80,000. It was these conditions that led to the organization of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.

The official "Historical Statement and Introduction" of the C.M.E. Church states:

> When the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, met in New Orleans, April, 1866, the Conference found that, by revolution and the fortunes of war, a change had taken place in our political and social relations, which made it necessary that a change should also be made for our organization into separate congregations, Districts, and Annual Conferences, if we desired it, and that when two or more Annual Conferences should be formed, if it was our wish, and met the approbation of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, we should have a General Conference organization like that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South . . .
>
> At the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Memphis, Tennessee, May, 1870, it was found that five Annual Conferences had been formed among us; and that an almost universal desire had been expressed on our part that we might be organized into a separate and distinct Church . . .[25]

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South fixed the date, and eight black annual conferences sent delegates to the General Conference December 15-21, 1870.[26] At this organizing Conference in Jackson, Tennessee, Bishops Robert S. Paine and Holland N. McTyeire of the Church, South presided; the organizing resolution provided that the name be the "Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America" and

> . . . That we request the bishops to organize our General Conference on the basis of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in its entire doctrine, discipline, and economy, making only such verbal alterations and changes as may be necessary to conform it to our name and the peculiarities of our condition.[27]

Thus the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church was established—the legitimate creation of another ecclesiastical body within the Methodist tradition—and William H. Miles and Richard H. Vanderhorst were elected to the episcopacy. In 1954 the name of the Church was changed. It is now "The Christian Methodist Episcopal Church" with approximately 500,000 members in approximately 2,600 churches.

Although the state of North Carolina and the North Carolina Conference were in the bounds of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and even though the North Carolina Conference reported some 1,202 colored members in 1869,[28] there was no Colored North Carolina Conference represented at the organizing General Conference of the C.M.E. Church in 1870. By vote of the 1869 Session of the North Carolina Conference (M.E. Church, South), Bishop David S. Doggett had been requested to "organize, at the earliest practicable day, a colored Conference"[29] within the bounds of that conference. No sufficient justification has been found for the Bishop's failure to organize a colored Conference in North Carolina between November, 1869 and December, 1870. The facts imply that by this time the Colored Methodists in North Carolina may no longer have been formally under the control of the white church.

In its report to the 1869 North Carolina Conference, the Committee on the Religious Interests of the Colored People contrasted the problematic situation of its colored work with the work in other states. Part of the report reads:

> Tennessee numbers two hundred colored preachers and nineteen Presiding Elders' Districts in her colored Conference; embracing the territory of the Memphis and Tennessee Conferences . . . Kentucky, Georgia and Alabama, have organized their colored Conferences. These are doing well. In our field of labor, many hurtful influences have been brought to bear upon society to alienate the colored race from us, and many who were of us, are in other folds, not improved by this change, and many are not content where they are. We are persuaded from the light we have that there is a desire, on the part of many of the colored people, to return to us and secure our sympathy and aid. No time therefore should be lost, no pains spared, no sacrifice be considered too great, if we would lead them to Jesus, who has redeemed them by his blood. Our social condition, our religion, our responsibility as ministers of Jesus, our duty as a Church to hold forth the word of life, all urge us, move us, to apply our best and wisest efforts to save them *now*.[30]

Too much time had already been lost. The other three Methodist denominations had organized their conferences in North Carolina, receiving the nucleus of their membership from among the black churches of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

In 1873, at a called meeting of the General Conference of the C.M.E. Church, Bishop Miles reported that he had organized four additional conferences, one of which was North Carolina.[31] Joseph A. Beebe of Washington, North Carolina, a former member of Zion, was elected Bishop and assigned to a district which included North Carolina. Bishop Beebe wrote an article for the March 25, 1874 edition of *The Christian Index*. Among other things he said:

> Our work in North Carolina is progressing, notwithstanding the strong opposition by the Zion Church which has monopolized the largest portion of the members of our Church because of the continued slander and unreasonable accusations brought against us.[32]

It would seem that the struggle with which the C.M.E. Church was established in North Carolina has followed it through the years. North Carolina was not a cradle of Colored Methodism as were states such as Tennessee and Kentucky. Almost forty years after the conference was organized, R. O. Langford witnessed only a minimal number of C.M.E. Churches here. In his *Memoirs of My Life,* Langford wrote:

> When I came from Alabama to North Carolina (1909), one could ride from Durham, N. C. via the Southern railroad to Chattanooga, Tenn., without seeing a C.M.E. Church. I say with modesty that I began closing the gap, when I organized Hanes Institutional C.M.E. Church (Winston-Salem) along with the late Drs. R. S. Stout and J. W. Roberts.[33]

Langford reported organizing two other churches in the state around 1922.[34] Today, the 45 pastoral appointments in North Carolina are part of the Carolina Conference, which comprises the work in North and South Carolina.[35]*

V

At least from the time of Evans' work in Fayetteville and William Meredith's work in Wilmington,[36] black people were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in North Carolina.

> At the Conference of December 4, 1844, there were 19,495 white members and 3,190 colored. Without consulting the wisdom of the latter, nearly the whole membership became a part of a new church, organized in May, 1845, and called the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Some colored members entered the A.M.E. Church, some the Colored M.E. Church of America, but thousands turned gladly to the bosom of the old Methodist Episcopal Church as it returned to the State after the Civil War.[37]

Elmer T. Clark, historian of the Western North Carolina Conference, describes how The Methodist Episcopal Church re-entered the South. The Virginia and North Carolina Mission Conference was organized in 1867 with nine charges in the State of North Carolina. In the next year (1868), the North Carolina Conference was organized.[38] Bishop E. R. Ames was the presiding Bishop and W. G. Matton was elected secretary. Twelve preachers received

---

*Note: I am indebted to Lawrence L. Reddick, a student at Duke Divinity School, for his research into the history of the C.M.E. Church. A member of that tradition, Mr. Reddick shared in the writing of this section.

appointments in this Conference which covered "the whole State except the area west of Watauga County and the Blue Ridge Mountains." Of the participation of blacks in those early years, Clark wrote:

> The work in the Conference was carried on among both the whites and Negroes and this continued until 1879. In 1876 two-thirds of the preachers were Negroes and the same was true in general of the membership. The plan of mixed ministry and membership did not prove successful and by 1872 there was a movement for separation.[39]

At the 1879 Session of the Conference, a resolution of separation[40] was adopted and Bishop Peck "announced the Conference divided."[41] An article in the February 20, 1879 edition of *Zion's Herald* reported that men, attracted by the missionary appropriation but not in sympathy with our church had begun to sow discord.

> They agitated the people on the color question, even going so far as to take votes on separation in their various circuits . . . They openly avowed on the Conference floor that they were ashamed to be known as members of a "nigger conference."[42]

Among the principles which Bishop Peck articulated to justify the separation were: "It seems to be the policy of the Church . . . It seems to be ordained in the providence of God . . . The colored men can live on less money than the whites . . ."[43]

When the North Carolina Conference met in High Point, February 4-7, 1880, it was almost totally black; nevertheless, it was this conference that was founded as a part of the Virginia and North Carolina Mission in 1867. It was this conference that was organized at Union Chapel in 1868. It was this conference that, because it was black, was made a part of the Central Jurisdiction for the sake of Methodist Union in 1939.[44] This Conference merged with the Virginia District to form the North Carolina-Virginia Conference in 1964. And after four years, the North Carolina-Virginia Conference was merged with the North Carolina, Western North Carolina and Virginia Conferences of the Southeastern Jurisdiction.

VI

It has never been easy for black people to be a part of that Methodist tradition which celebrates the Bicentennial of the Carolina Circuit. The Methodists of North Carolina are not one people. Their hope to be such cannot be realized until black Methodists and white Methodists and all other Methodists can live out the freedom which the Gospel brings to all who would follow Christ.

LEON COLLEGE LIBRARY

CHAPTER EIGHT

North Carolina Methodist Theology in Post-Bellum Nineteenth Century

Robert T. Osborn

The Reverend A. M. Chreitzberg, a Methodist minister of South Carolina, tells a delightful story on himself. It concerns his preaching in 1862 in Bethel Church of Charleston, South Carolina. He writes:

> There were near fourteen hundred colored communicants. Morning and afternoon of the Sabbath were devoted to the witness, with the usual monthly communion service to the colored in the afternoon, while every Sabbath night was given to them separately in old Bethel. This service was always thronged—galleries, lower floor, chancel, pulpit, steps and all. . . . The preacher could not complain of any deadly space between himself and congregation. He was positively breast up to his people, with no possible loss of the *en rapport*. Though ignorant of it at the time, he remembers now the cause of the enthusiasm under his deliverances anent the "law of liberty" and "freedom from Egyptian bondage." What was figurative they interpreted literally. He thought of but one ending of the war; they quite another. He remembers the 68th Psalm as affording numerous texts for their delectation; e.g., "Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered"; His "march through the wilderness"; "The chariots of God are twenty thousand"; . . . and especially, "Though ye have lain among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold." It is mortifying now to think that his comprehension was not equal to the African intellect. All he thought about was relief from the

This chapter was written by Robert T. Osborn, Professor of Religion, Department of Religion, Duke University.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 159.

> servitude of sin, and freedom from the bondage of the devil; and as to the wings of silver and feathers of gold, that was only strong hyperbole for spiritual good. But they interpreted it literally in the good time coming. . . .[1]

The implications of this experience in the life of the Reverend Chreitzberg are much greater than he realized and point to dimensions of southern Methodist theology that are rarely noted and scarcely counted by commentators. First is that fact that southern Methodism is both black and white and after the war was represented by such black churches as the A.M.E., the A.M.E. Zion, and the C.M.E. churches, as well as by the white M.E. Church, South. Furthermore, with the exception of home missionary expeditions of the M.E. Church, all southern Methodist denominations, black and white, had separated from the M.E. church over the race issue, so that each denomination was in fact no more or less representative of mother Methodism than the others, and only prejudiced white eyes could pretend to focus only on white theology and yet represent faithfully North Carolina Methodism.[2]

More directly significant is the point of the Chreitzberg story that although black and white Methodism in the South had common texts (in this case a common sermon) these texts often meant one thing for whites and another for blacks; which is to say that there were different theologies. And of course there were indeed theologies. For those who are smiling at the notion of even a Methodist theology in the nineteenth century, not to mention a North Carolina Methodist theology, I simply observe that as certainly as preachers like Chreitzberg were trained and were preaching in North Carolina in the nineteenth century, there was a theology or theologies at work. In North Carolina as throughout the South, the majority of the ministers, black and white, entered their conferences through their various conference courses of study which were significantly similar to each other.[3] This similarity reflects of course their common heritage in the Wesleyan movement and the Methodist Episcopal Church. And furthermore, it was not until the post-bellum period that blacks in North Carolina had any access to the Christian tradition except through the oral tradition of white preaching. One of Methodism's early and famous preachers was "Black Harry" Evans, who could neither read nor write but who did hear well and could occasionally preach Francis Asbury's sermons and message better than Asbury himself.[4] But again, we must not forget the point of Chreitzberg's experience and fail to recognize that coming from Black Harry's lips and

falling on black ears, the preaching often took on a different theological "caste and color."

It should be obvious, however, that when we speak of theology in this context we are not talking about academic theology in the strict sense. In the nineteenth century North Carolina had neither a seminary nor publishing theologians of note; indeed, not until 1873 did the M.E. Church, South have its own seminary in Vanderbilt.[5] As for the blacks, they had not even Vanderbilt, though A.M.E. Zion commissioned Hood Seminary in Salisbury, North Carolina in 1910.[6] This means that the primary expressions of theology in North Carolina must be among the "grass roots" in the theology that informed preaching and the actual life of the church. Because of the limits of this paper I have focused on the post-bellum period, and for black theology, primarily on the A.M.E. Zion Church, which had its southern, indeed its national strength, during this period in North Carolina.[7] Without seminaries the education of preachers, black and white, was largely the work of Bible departments in the rising college system of the Church and the conference courses of study. Some references will be made to a few of the more important books assigned for these courses.[8]

From these general observations suggestion comes for the approach to this examination of North Carolina Methodist theology in the nineteenth century. We have seen that it shares a language common not only to Southern Methodism but in large measure to Methodism as a whole.[9] At the same time, we will recognize that tacitly and often explicitly, that language speaks differently in black and white contexts. Therefore, we will want to take a look at both these contexts to see how they determine the fundamental theological vision. That is to say, we will be raising hermeneutical or methodological questions in order to establish not so much what the theology was but how it was written and read or spoken and heard. I will be seeking to determine the basic idiom and the primary message of theology in each context. And, as I have amply indicated, the social context of the theologian, whether he is black or white, dominant or dominated, possessed or dispossessed, will prove to be of decisive significance for the answer.[10]

Therefore, in the following exposition I ask first about the text—the common theological heritage of post-bellum North Carolina Methodist theology. Second, we will consider the context of both white and black Methodism in the South. Third, in light of the context I would ask about the "pre-text," the pre-understanding that informed the interpretation of the texts in each of the

contexts. Finally, we will examine typical expressions of theology in the white and then the black contexts. Throughout I will be relying primarily on sermons and writings of North Carolina Methodists. In conclusion, I will suggest certain implications for the ongoing task of theology in North Carolina Methodism.

Before proceeding, I am moved to warn the reader that I write primarily as a theologian and secondarily as a historian, which means that I am reading and interpreting this bit of theological history in order to speak a critical word to the Church of the late twentieth century. The reader should therefore be prepared for an argument, in which I trust he or shee will engage—possibly in warm agreement or even warmer disagreement, or perhaps with critical circumspection. In any event the reader will be aware that in order to argue the theological case and at the same time offer an interpretation and not merely a history of the theology of the period, I have made selective use of the available materials and exaggerated certain emphases. My hope is not to settle issues but to raise them, and I would be indeed disappointed were this effort to generate no discussion, animated perhaps by frequent frowns or even an occasional smile.

The Common Text:

The common sources and text of nineteenth century Methodist theology was what Robert E. Chiles calls a "Wesleyan orthodoxy."[11] Wesley himself rested his case on the grace and power of God, manifested objectively in the atonement of Christ and subjectively in the work of the Holy Spirit as it gave rise to the freedom of faith and the obedience of the Christian life. Following the lead of Richard Watson, this original trust in the divine offense and in the power of the biblical witness as such, is exchanged for an apologetic defense of the Wesleyan doctrine.[12] On the one hand, the work and significance of Christ is defended by an appeal to natural theology and to the capacity of the scientific mind to recognize miracle. On the other, the freedom of faith and the grace of the Christian life are undergirded by philosophical notions of the freedom of the will and man's moral responsibility. However, while these new, defensive elements are added, the characteristic Wesleyan emphases upon scripture, atonement, Holy Spirit and, of course, sin, are maintained.

I call attention to this difference between the original Wesleyan witness to the initiative or offense of the divine grace and the later defense posture of Wesleyan orthodoxy, because I think we will

find an analagous difference between the theology of the black and white North Carolina Methodists in the nineteenth century. Thus both could appeal to the same biblical and Wesleyan texts and yet say or hear thereby significantly different messages.

The Southern Context:

The difference between the two theologies, black and white, is to be found in the different contexts in which the theology was done. To appreciate this point we should remember that the history of Methodism in America very closely paralleled the history of the nation itself.[13] A new nation, institutionalizing and defending its position relative to the rest of the world, is a likely context for a similar and related institutionalizing defense of the comparably new Methodist denomination. In the North the process can be said to have been successful, and the history moved without discontinuity from its beginning to the successful establishment of the nation. Similarly, Methodism in the North moved from its Wesleyan foundations, through a defensive orthodoxy, to a successful, established liberalism that found its place in the world. It could and did accept the scientific, historical criticism of the Bible and, inspired by a consequently new vision of the historical setting of the prophets and Jesus, could engage the world in which it had now found its home with a "social gospel." Both historical criticism and the social gospel were not to be found in the South, for reasons to which we now turn.

The situation in the South was very different from the North. The white South was a defeated, humiliated South; its history had been interrupted and broken.[14] In the aftermath of the war its situation was more similar to that of the nation at the beginning of its history as it came out of battle to face the task of consolidation and shaping of a new nation, than it was to the contemporary situation of the nation as a whole for which the civil war had testified *ex post facto* to the continuity and successful establishment of its tradition and institutions. Ironically, the situation of the white Southerner bore some similarity to that of his former black slave, for both of them knew what it meant to be put down, and both were seeking to rise. Nevertheless, the situations were more significantly different. Above all, the black had been a slave and not a citizen; the past that the white had lost the black had never possessed. The American story and the story of the Methodist Church were not really his stories, at least until the end of the war. Unlike his former master, he had no history in the land that he

cared to defend or recover; rather, now for the first time he had a promise and a future, the beginning at last of his own history.[15] The white, on the other hand, not only had a past and a memory he cherished, but he had his "whiteness" vis à vis the "blackness" of his former slave, an enduring reminder of his superiority and a cherished token of his lost but eternal and indomitable past.[16] The white man was down, but not so low as the black; that distinction was a constant and gracious source of the promise and hope of recovery.[17]

In sum, the war's end found both black and white Methodists alienated—the white from his recently lost past which he would seek to recover and the black from his newly discovered future which he would struggle to gain. Both were, therefore, in a fashion that distinguished them from their Northern brethren, aware of the corresponding reality of the presence and power of sin.[18] Whereas the North was beginning to experience the here and now as the time and place of the kingdom, the South, both black and white, was experiencing it as the reality the Bible designates as "the world," as the time and place of the devil. The kingdom was yet to come, for the whites as a recovered lost paradise and for the blacks as a newly discovered and promised Zion.

The "Pre-Text" of White Theology

The differences in the black and white contexts account for the profoundly different theological perspectives. Each comes at the common text, the common theological heritage, with a distinctive vision or "pretext." Simply stated, a theology which looks back through the Bible is wholly other from one that looks ahead with the Bible. The former is a "theology of recovery," the other a "theology of discovery."

Let us look first at the "theology of recovery" of the white Methodists of North Carolina. As regards its form, its style and fundamental idiom, a theology of recovery is a "truth"-seeking theology. As might be expected from a society to which history has brought only its fall, it was not to look for God in that historical process, either in the present moment of history or its promised future. Rather, it was in quest of eternal truth, the truth of the divine order that withstands the erosion of time.[19] In these terms it understood the biblical revelation as a revelation of such truths—truth first of all about the nature and perfections of deity,[20] but secondly and no less significantly the moral truths of the divine government ordained in creation and sustained by providence.[21]

If formally this theology is a truth-seeking theology, then materially its norm is God as creator, governor and judge of the world—the source of eternal order and ultimate deliverance from the world whose history is a continuing, undialectical fall from its eternal foundation and truth.[22] Eternal truth is of God; historical process is of the devil; eternity is the realm of divine righteousness; time is the dimension of human sin. Late in the nineteenth century, the North Carolina minister, William H. Moore, preaching on "God's Government," recognized that "the world moves—it moves with the strides of a giant. . . ." However, he added, "there is our danger." The world demands "a new religion," or at least a new "construction of Bible doctrines": But, says he, "we have none to give." "God's government is the same today as it always was. . . ."[23] Earlier, in 1878, in a fraternal address to the Christian Church on behalf of North Carolina Methodism, he recognized that there were changes in Methodism, but that they occurred "entirely in our ecclesiastical polity, not in our doctrines or exposition of them." Changes otherwise are largely rooted in "the ravings of infidelity" which have made "our ministry more zealous in pointing to the 'old paths,' taking heed to the doctrine and more firmly administering the Discipline."[24] All that the future would appear to promise is a death that leads to heaven, so consequently he can "thank God [that] it is still true that our people die well!"[25] Theology is the stating and defense of orthodoxy, of true and right doctrine.[26]

Expressions of White Theology

As we have noted, a central element in the common theological heritage of Methodism is the doctrine of the atonement.[27] According to Summers, "the Atonement is the satisfaction made to God for the sins of all mankind . . . by the mediation of Christ," so that "the divine perfections are kept in harmony, the authority of the sovereign upheld . . . and the strongest motives are brought upon sinners to lead them to repentance . . . to a life of obedience. . . ."[28] By Christ's substitution and sacrifice penalty is paid for man's sins, and by his exaltation and example God's government is established. "If he [God] creates moral beings he must govern; he must exact obedience from them."[29] God is the exacting governor who brings moral order to the disobedient and disordered spirit of man. As one North Carolina preacher stated it, God "bought us with a price, no less precious than the 'blood of Christ.' Hence the Almighty has an indispensable right to furnish a system

of law for our government . . . authoritatively commanding us to walk therein."[30]

The effects of the atonement are two-fold. As the redemption of sinners it brings salvation to souls and the new life of individual and personal holiness as manifest in a separation from "the world." As the establishment of the divine government, atonement results in the church.[31] On the occasion of the celebration of the Centennial of Methodism in 1876 in Raleigh, L. S. Burkhead stated that "the salvation of souls is the one grand design of all operations of Methodism."[32] The Reverend J. W. Jenkins finds the model of such a Christian in Philemon, who was "a most loveable man," with a soul "full of sympathy," who dispenses a "liberal, benevolent hospitality," "rules his household" and "must have been a good business man." Above all, he also had a church in his home. Needless to say, so devout a man does not drink, dance, fornicate or commit adultery.[33]

We can sum up and say that the holy life of the saved soul is one of inner moral order, social respectability in the tradition of the old South, family fidelity, doctrinal rectitude and church loyalty. Such ordered lives can know nothing of the disorderly ways of the world which are inevitable concomitants of alcohol, the dance and sexual license.

However, a perusal of sermons, conference addresses, *The Raleigh Advocate,* and theological texts offer unequivocal testimony that nothing was more characteristic of southern and North Carolina Methodism than its ecclesiology. At the Raleigh centennial celebration, L. S. Burkhead introduces the volume, *The Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina,* with a panegyric to the Methodist Church: "As an ecclesiastical aggressive organism, Methodism has no equal. It is grand in unity, sublime in the harmonious operations of its machinery, and glorious in its efficiency."[34] Of course, such a church must have "the purest and most perfectly Scriptural system of doctrine" and will develop out of this system "the most exalted Christian life and experience. . . ."[35] It is the bastion of eternity, the sole locus of the eternal divine government in a world of hopeless change. The hope that the eternal order, which was found in ante-bellum southern society but is lost to the present age might again prevail, rests with this glorious church. So, "enlightened Christian statesmen should make it [the state] subservient to the advancement of religion" which will be consonant with "the elevation of society and the welfare of mankind."[36]

The atonement of Christ establishes the eternal divine government in the soul of man and in the world only insofar as the church extends into the world. The world as such, as the realm of change for the worse, is no place for the Christian to seek or to expect the word and work of God. One looks therefore almost wholly in vain for any direct or explicit recognition of the political or social situation in either the preaching or the theology of post-bellum white theology in North Carolina. Even so exceptional and educated a man as Trinity College's Braxton Craven can preach in 1864 on "Signs of the Times" with no direct or explicit reference to the times. He speaks symbolically of "the terror and pomp of Sinai" and calls his hearers to make their exodus to "the land of grace where they shall be free of fear," to live "the new and noble life" of "full inspiration, rich harmony, life's mountain."[37] Short of the church's triumphant extension, the Christian has no hope in this world; his hope is wholly in the world to come. As we noted, the most to be hoped for is to "die well," in the promise of an eternal home. "Salvation means not only deliverance from the condemnation of God's holy law . . . but it means the present consciousness of God's favor, and the blissful contemplation of a heavenly life."[38] As another North Carolina Methodist preacher states, the Christian exists in "saintliness of character here, and in glorious exaltation hereafter."[39]

The "Pre-text" of Black Theology

Corresponding to the distinctive black context, the Black approaches his theology with a very different vision. Recall again the Chreitzberg incident. He remembered the enthusiasm of his black congregation when he preached about the "law of liberty" and "freedom from Egyptian bondage." At the time he thought of "but one ending of the war; they quite another." "What was figurative they interpreted literally." For Chreitzberg the war's end would mean the recovery and preservation of the past, whereas for the oppressed black slave it meant the discovery and promise of a liberating future. Hope was its key signature, freedom its constant refrain. Hope born of the crucified and resurrected Jesus "held a suffering race together—for they believed that through him this freedom would come in their world and their salvation in the world to come."[40]

The hope of the black Methodist and the future it gave him were, paradoxically, gifts of his past. But his past was quite different from that of the white, for it was not his American or even

his Methodist past, but his own uniquely God-given past. With a self-consciousness similar to the Jew's, the black, moved by the witness of scripture and by the vision of his faith, claimed through his African heritage an original participation in the covenant history of the Old Testament and its promised fulfillment in the New.[41] In America he had no history, no story he could claim as his own; but he was not therefore without a history, since he discovered as a gift of God to his race his true and only story in this redemptive history.[42] And this original, biblical story he indeed lived as out of the nothingness of his Babylonian captivity in America he made his exodus with the black church toward the land of promised justice. His church was not a static expression of an eternal, changeless order in a world with no future, but the company of those who by the power and promise of God were changing the world in a faithful and hopeful claiming of the divine promise. His theology was not a theology of law and order but of life and liberation.

The basic idiom of this theology is history. Even before he could as a rule read or write, let alone benefit from and share the word of historical criticism, the black perceived even more profoundly than did the new scientific and historical hermeneutics (which in the nineteenth century did not affect Southern white theology) that the Bible is not a collection of doctrinal propositions about the being of God and his eternal law, but rather the story of his merciful acts in the arena of human history for the redemption of man and the glorious fulfillment of that history.[43] The divine government of which the Bible speaks (the Kingdom of God) is the promised and coming day of righteousness.[44] The God of the Bible is not the static God of law, but the loving and powerful God who battles for the life and liberty of his people.

But we must underline the fact that not only did the Black read the Bible as a history book, but as the word of God, as if the biblical history were his first and only history. He did not come to it as did the southern White—in search of his lost past history, but as one who for the first time discovered his history. This story then became the criterion of all others. There could be no apologetics, no effort to answer to the present as in the North, no attempt through it to return to the past as in the South. No, only in this story was there past or present. The black Methodist Christian was a biblical man and a God man, pure and simple, and this meant he was a man of history, a man of the world because his

history and his world had a divine future, the coming kingdom of personal liberty and world redemption.

Expressions of Black Theology

Since the first and only true story is the biblical story of God's redemption, it is only in light of this story that the truth of the human story can be seen. Whereas the white tended to read the Bible in light of his situation, the black read his situation in light of the Bible. The chaos of the present situation, the loss of the old order and the stabilities of the past, led the white Methodist theologian to understand sin as disorder, as the unseemly, as a collapse of the divine law and government. The black, taking his cue from the biblical story of redemption, especially the stories of the exodus and the story of the compassionate, suffering Jesus, understood God as the one who sees the suffering and bondage of his people, who hears their cry and in his mercy comes to set them free.[45] Sin, by this witness to the divine liberation, is identified as that which holds man down, renders him helpless, oppresses him and denies him the freedom, dignity and glory for which God would liberate him.[46]

Furthermore, because this story of redemption is the only true story, all the other stories men live are revealed as the false stories of sin. Sin is now seen in the tradition of Wesley, as a radical and inescapable dimension of life. Southern white theology acknowledged the dominion of sin in the external world, but alleged to have found sanctuary from it within the pious soul and within the church as the community of such souls. Blacks, perceiving that sin is radical and all-embracing, knew that the only sanctuary was to be had in the coming victory of God over the world. The irony of the white view was that its retreat into the soul and away from the world in despair of the world gave the world free and uncritical reign, so that white theology could condemn worldliness and at the same time commend a public expression of piety in the form of a quiet, obedient acceptance of the world's order. Black theology, aware of no such escape from sin, condemned not only its expressions in the personal life but also in the political, economic and social order.[47] Sin so infected the world that there could be no salvation in the world unless there be a salvation of the world.

The dominant view of the atonement in black theology is already before us as an implication of the definition of sin. In a word, it views God's work in Christ as that of the pitying, compassionate God coming into the arena of human history to over-

throw those forces which bind man in "helpless grief."[48] Jesus came, said Bishop Hood, "to take the thrones of this world from Satan." He will depose the alien government and set up his own. "The earth will be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as waters cover the deep."[49] And this victorious conquest and dethronement of Satan, this re-establishment of the divine government, is the coming of the divine kingdom *on* earth, as it is in heaven. It is a social and political reality, an immanent, earthly dominion.

We should note just briefly that black theology of course had also a substitutionary view of the atonement. As Bishop Hood stated, before Satan can be dethroned and God's government established, "men must be made righteous."[50] Since the citizen of the world is "no longer controlled by the nobler powers of the world" and has become "the abject slave of carnal sense,"[51] the divine government requires a new citizen. (Note the suggestion that sin is slavery, a condition of helplessness and oppression.) It was necessary, therefore, that Jesus "assume our nature with all its imperfections and liability to temptation."[52] But, again, it is a black emphasis that "Christ did not come to pay a debt, but to conquer man's enemies. . . ."[53] "He did not offer a penal sacrifice to appease the alleged wrath of God, to satisfy the divine justice, or to purchase God's favor for man." Rather, it was a matter of the divine love. "His compassion sprang to the rescue of the fallen."[54] He summarizes: ". . . by that perfect word, Christ lifted His, and with His our humanity from the state of degradation into a progressive conjunction with the divine nature of the Father."[55]

Black Methodist theology further reveals its distinctive tone when we ask about the benefits of Christ's atonement. When Christ "lifted His with our humanity from the state of degradation," he raised up "Christ's soldiers" who are "fighting under his banner," whose "duty is not only not to lose heart but to press forward and gain more ground continually."[56] Bishop Hood declared that the Negro Church "puts him [the Christian] on a line of march to the front, in which he need not stumble, but may, if he will, push with vigor on til he reaches the acme of human usefulness and greatness."[57] Claiming this gift of Christ's atonement, the founders of A.M.E. Zion, says Bishop Hood, "were men of devout piety . . . noted for their devotion to the principles which stand for untrammeled manhood and unrestrained freedom of every being who bears the image of his Creator. . . ."[58] Therefore, like his white counterpart, the black Methodist preacher consistently condemned the drinking of alcohol beverages, sexual license and any

other injurious practice.[59] And positively, he put a very high premium upon education.[60] But in all this we must recognize a difference of intention from comparable white preaching, for whereas the white was concerned for social peace and order, the black was concerned about the fitness of the Christian soldier for the battle to overcome the social order. "A good fight must be fought in the interest of truth, justice, righteousness, benevolence, purity and happiness."[61] And as we have been led to expect, these are not abstract "spiritual" ends, but concrete historical, political and social ends, the chief of which was justice for the blacks. I should add, however, that black theology was generally persuaded that through his deliverance of the blacks God was also caring for the white brethren.[62] But the immediate issue was continuing racial injustice, a problem which "confronts us ever and anon."[63]

I could go on, but only if the reader were to pursue comparable white Episcopal addresses, or compare the *Star of Zion* with the *Raleigh Advocate,* could he comprehend how wholly other from white theology is this focus of black theology on the concrete issues of the political, economic and social order. Black theology shared the white hope of eternal life beyond the grave, but its hope for the world, its attack upon present systemic evils and its vision of a promised reign of justice and righteousness in this life are simply without parallel anywhere in white theology.[64]

Finally, a further word about the Church. To appreciate the distinctive thrust of North Carolina's black Methodism, let us hear first a summary word on the Church from the Reverend John J. Tigert of the white Methodist Church South. He was delivering a fraternal address from his denomination to the Methodist Church (North). He wrote:

> The Church is indeed a mission, celestial in origin and divine in equipment, in the midst of populations foreign and estranged. And the peculiar end of the Church is the proclamation to these dying populations of the finished redemption in Christ. If she confounds this divine design with even those laudable ends which she seeks in common with other organized societies, she is stripped of her glory. . . .[65]

His meaning is clear. As a celestial reality the Church is not involved in the temporal realities of this social world, except as by her non-involvement she reinforces them. So, he assures his northern brethren that "both white and black will, we think, give most devout adherence" to the Southern creed "that the highest welfare of either race is safe in the keeping of the other, and that perpetual unity will reign between them if there is no tampering with the

fundamental laws of the social order which are the uniform conditions of a stable body politic throughout the civilized world."[66]

For Bishop Hood, by contrast, it is precisely those fundamental laws of the social order that keep the black down and against which the black church must therefore contend. Society dominated by whites and sustained by their church offered the black neither truth nor possibility. It is only in the black church, which was his "pillar and ground of truth,"[67] that the black had his "only instrumentality for the developing of the race."[68] The church was the base from which, in the name of God, the black fought for his life, for the life promised him in Jesus Christ. Both black and white Methodists expected great things from the church; for the white it was the symbol and only real moment in a lost past; for the black it was the present reality and token in promise of the coming Kingdom of God. Although the black church was born out of the witness of the white church, the white church nevertheless had become part of that against which the black church was called to struggle.

Conclusion:

It ought by now be apparent that this paper does not pretend to be the result of an exhaustive empirical survey of North Carolina Methodism in the nineteenth century; rather, it is a theological interpretation of what I have identified as distinctive tendencies. As such I have therefore made selective use of my materials and exaggerated emphases in order to make my point. Of course not all white theology is so "white" or is all black theology so distinctively "black" as I have suggested. Let me note especially the temptation of black theology to succumb as did the white church to what might be called "ecclesiastical inflation." Most black histories of black Methodism speak much more of its own greatness and the goodness of its leaders than of the glory of its God and the wonders of his grace.[69] It was not at all uncommon for the leaders in the black liberation army of Christ to focus on their own establishment, to view the army itself as the goal and achievement of black faith rather than as a God-given means for the realization of its true and divine destiny. Ecclesiasticism was a chronic threat to both black and white Methodism.

I have stressed the "this worldliness" of black theology—its hope of liberation in this world. But because it also believed in the salvation of souls in the life after death it was tempting for the black ecclesiastical establishment to retreat behind this latter expec-

tation rather than to lead the troops forward in the struggle for liberation. So here too when we are speaking of "this worldliness" we are speaking of a distinctive tendency and not a universal reality within the black church.

Methodism, black and white, then as now, and perhaps in a fashion sadly paradigmatic for Protestantism as a whole, has tended to put its church above its gospel, form above content, sign above the signified. For the white the order and life of the church, or the inner peace and order of the saved soul, tended to be equated with the divine order and the eternal life it was called to attest; and, as we have seen, the black church was tempted to fight for itself rather than to offer itself in the divine struggle for the promised justice of God's coming kingdom.

With these caveats, what may we nevertheless conclude? As regards the formal question of the nature and task of theology, far and away the most significant lesson to be drawn from this study is the importance for theology of the social context of the theologian. Black and white Methodist theology in North Carolina in the nineteenth century are different, and since they have a common source and text, we conclude that the radically different contexts alone account for the differences. If we are to draw any inferences relevant to the continuing theological task of North Carolina Methodism, it is that we must be very self-conscious about and responsible for who and where we are as we do theology.

The second and equally important conclusion is more concrete—namely, that the two contexts which determined North Carolina Methodist theology in the nineteenth century are still with us to determine twentieth century theology. Today, North Carolina Methodists can either do theology as those who have a stake in this world, as those who have something to regain or to hold in the present order; or, we can try to do it in common cause with the dispossessed, the marginals and oppressed, who have nothing to lose and everything to gain in the story of God's merciful battle for human liberation.

Thirdly, if indeed we have these options today, we can begin to test which is the right one by considering the theological issue in the nineteenth century. Which perspective is it that brought the Gospel into proper focus, or, better asked, to which situation is it that the Gospel addresses itself? Obviously I have not sought to conceal my persuasion that the black perspective is the most fruitful. I cite only the fact that because of his vision the black was able to view the Bible historically and socially long before his

white brethren were able, and without the help of external, historial criticism. He discerned immediately the genre of the biblical word. We might suspect that he was also therefore in a position to hear and receive its message—the message of a loving God who in his holy power enters the arena of human history to lift up his people and set them free: "liberty in this world and salvation in the world to come."

We must remember, on the other hand, that white theology, for all its shortcomings, yes, even perhaps because of them, because of its conservativism and anxiety to preserve tradition, did indeed preserve and pass on that very Christian tradition and gospel which the black found so liberating from all traditions. Nevertheless, I venture to conclude that we who are white North Carolina Methodists may be distinguished among American white Christians just because of this unique black experience—(especially the A.M.E. Zion Church)—so very much in our past and so much with us today. North Carolina black Methodist theology may well be the very possibility and promise of an uniquely responsible white North Carolina Methodist theology in these remaining decades of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER NINE

Methodism and Higher Education in North Carolina, 1776-1976

ALBEA GODBOLD

Methodism's higher education record in North Carolina during the first two centuries of the nation's history is significant. John Dickins (1747-1798) who was born in London and educated at Eton College, emigrated to America prior to 1774, became a Methodist traveling preacher in 1777, and served in North Carolina. In 1780 while on the Roanoke Circuit, Dickins and Francis Asbury prepared a plan for what Asbury called "a Kingswood School" after the one John Wesley established in Bristol, England, and Dickins proceeded to collect money for the project.[1]

In 1783 Asbury appointed Dickins pastor of John Street Church, New York City. In October 1784 Dickins met Thomas Coke as the latter arrived with Wesley's plan for a Methodist Church in America. Presumably Dickins told Coke at that time of the proposed school in North Carolina. Coke wanted a college, and it is believed the money raised by Dickins was diverted to Cokesbury College in Maryland, the institution created by the 1784 Christmas Conference.[2]

In view of John Dickins' priority in planning, in promotion, and in raising funds for a school in North Carolina, he may be

This chapter was written by Albea Godbold, Executive Secretary, Emeritus, Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church, Lake Junaluska, North Carolina.

Footnotes for this Chapter begin on Page 162.

regarded as in a real sense the father of Methodist education in this state.[3]

The destruction of Cokesbury College by fire in 1795 set back American Methodist zeal for higher education some two decades. Following that disaster Asbury concluded the Lord had not raised up the Methodists to build colleges.[4] Consequently the General Conference journals from 1796 through 1812 reveal no interest in or plans on the part of the denomination to establish colleges. Indeed for many years there was among Methodists prejudice against education; the denomination officially opposed the establishment of theological seminaries until near the middle of the nineteenth century.[5]

The first sign of renewed interest in education on the part of the General Conference appeared in 1816 when that body deplored the lack of education among ministers, declared acquisition of knowledge to be a ministerial duty, and instructed the bishops to prepare a course of study for young preachers.[6] Then in 1820 the General Conference recommended that all annual conferences "establish as soon as practicable, literary institutions, under their control, in such a way and manner as they may think proper."[7]

By 1840 higher education had become a major interest of American Methodism. In that year the Bishops' Address to the General Conference declared that a "system of collegiate education" was "loudly called for."[8] By that time the Methodist Episcopal Church owned or controlled twelve colleges and academies in the states of Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia, not to mention many more in the rest of the nation.[9]

I

As time passed North Carolina Methodism assisted in the founding of Randolph-Macon College, the denomination's oldest permanent institution of learning in America, and it had the honor of launching Greensboro College, the second oldest enduring college for women in the land.[10] Those were notable achievements, especially in view of the fact that there was no North Carolina Annual Conference as such until it was created by order of the 1836 General Conference. Prior to that date all of the circuits in eastern North Carolina were attached to the Virginia Conference, while those on the South Carolina border and in the mountains remained linked with the South Carolina and Holston conferences until 1850 and 1890, respectively.

Consider North Carolina Methodism's role in the founding of Randolph-Macon College. The Virginia Conference began discussing the possibility of starting a college in 1825 and referred the matter to a committee for study. Succeeding conference sessions debated the subject, and some preachers began taking collections for the cause. Thus the college was chartered February 3, 1830, and it opened in 1832.

The most active Virginia Conference preacher in the movement which led to the establishment of Randolph-Macon College was H. G. Leigh, a native of Perquimans County, N. C.[11] Moreover, Leigh hoped the school would be located in the North Carolina part of the conference, and later it was said that if the founders had not believed they could get state aid by placing the institution in Virginia (they were mistaken), Randolph-Macon would have been domiciled in North Carolina.[12]

Though Randolph-Macon was established in Virginia, from the outset Leigh and other North Carolina Methodists loyally supported it. Invited to preach at the college in the absence of the chaplain, Leigh called for penitents at the close of his sermon, and "a large number of students with streaming eyes went to the altar." The occasion was the beginning of a revival which "embraced nearly all the young men" in the school.[13]

The North Carolina Conference held its first session at Greensboro in January 1838. Agreeing that financial subscriptions previously made to Randolph-Macon College were binding, the body pledged its continued support. It voted to raise $10,000 for the school, provided the trustees would grant the conference five scholarships in perpetuity. Furthermore, the conference authorized the appointment of a financial agent to raise money for the college.[14] Obviously such a firm commitment to the continued support of Randolph-Macon meant the conference had no intention of starting its own college for men in 1838 or in the near future.

Assuming it would support Randolph-Macon College indefinitely, the North Carolina Conference directed its delegates to the 1840 General Conference to ask that body to authorize the appointment of a North Carolina Conference preacher to the station at Randolph-Macon College two years in each quadrennium. The General Conference did not comply.[15]

It is interesting to note that while the North Carolina Conference in its first session reaffirmed its support of Randolph-Macon College, it also proceeded to establish Greensboro College for

women. No doubt one reason was that it found a budding college for women on its doorstep, so to speak, when it convened in 1838.

A school for girls had grown up around the Methodist church in Greensboro, the church itself having been established in 1830. Supporters of the school had approached the Virginia Conference in 1837 and that body appointed trustees. Since Greensboro fell within the bounds of the newly created North Carolina Conference, it was to be expected that friends of the school would attend the conference's first session and ask for help. The conference took favorable action, and "Greensboro Female College" was chartered in 1838, the document stipulating that one-half of the trustees should be members of the North Carolina Conference.[16]

In launching Greensboro College in 1838, North Carolina Methodism joined the vanguard of a distinctive Southern movement for the higher education of women. By 1860 there were a number of colleges and seminaries for women in the South.[17]

As the decade of the 1840's progressed, possibly some thought the cooperation of the Virginia and North Carolina conferences in maintaining a Methodist college for men in Virginia and one for women in North Carolina approached the ideal in church supported higher education. But as the decade of the 1850's advanced it became evident that the cooperation would cease.

As it turned out, the rise of a private college for men in North Carolina which aspired to affiliation with the Methodist conference, along with a rousing quarrel between the president of Randolph-Macon College and a professor in the University of North Carolina abruptly ended the biconference support of higher education in 1857.

The North Carolina college seeking conference affiliation was Normal in Randolph County. Chartered in 1851, it had grown out of Union Institute, an elementary school which began about 1830 as a cooperative venture of the Methodists and Quakers in the community. In 1839 Brantley York, a Methodist preacher, was the teacher. The school was chartered as Union Institute Academy in 1841. In that year Braxton Craven, a youth of 19 or 20, enrolled as a student and was soon elected assistant teacher. In 1842 York went to another school and Craven became the principal of Union Institute.

The school prospered under Craven's leadership. Interested in training teachers, he persuaded the legislature to recharter the institution as Normal College. Craven also sought state aid for the college but received only a ten-thousand dollar loan from the State

Literary Fund. A burden for years, the loan was finally repaid in depreciated Confederate currency.

Aware of the need for patronage if his college was to survive, Craven turned to the North Carolina Conference of which he was a member. In 1851 the college trustees offered to admit Methodist ministerial students free of tuition fees, if the conference would endorse the school and appoint a visiting committee. The conference agreed, but in turn asked for the right to appoint one of its own members as professor of English literature in the college.

Of course in 1851 the North Carolina Conference was still officially committed to the support of Randolph-Macon College in Virginia. Apparently the conference assumed an incipient tie with Normal College would not alter its relationship with the Virginia institution.

Then in 1855-56 came the above mentioned dispute between W. A. Smith, president of Randolph-Macon College, and Charles F. Deems, the Carolina professor who was also a member of the North Carolina Conference. They were able men and prominent members of their respective conferences. It was said that each aspired to the episcopacy, and that may have been a factor in the quarrel. Each formally preferred charges against the other's character in the other's conference.

In time the squabble between Deems and Smith aroused ill feeling between the two conferences, and in 1856 when the animosity between the two bodies was at its peak, Craven offered his college to the North Carolina Conference and it was accepted. The next year the conference formally withdrew support from Randolph-Macon College. Thus ended some thirty years of cooperation between North Carolina and Virginia Methodism in the support of higher education.[18]

Obviously Normal was not an appropriate name for a college closely identified with a Methodist annual conference. Therefore the institution was rechartered as Trinity College February 19, 1859. From that day forward Trinity was the most important Methodist college in North Carolina.

From 1857 to 1892 when it moved to Durham, Trinity was a typical church college of the time—located in a rural area, small, patronized by middle class people, continually in debt, and characterized by one or more religious revivals on the campus each year. Religion was an important part of college life. If and when a revival began, classes might be suspended several days while

efforts were made to win converts among the students. President Craven reported 1,157 conversions of students from 1842 to 1876.

From its beginning until it moved to Durham, Trinity College was always in straitened financial circumstances. During Craven's presidency he and the professors had stipulated salaries, but they seldom if ever collected them in full in any school year. The pressing bills of the school were paid, and then the balance of the cash was divided among the president and the professors. But since the teaching staff had to have some money even if some urgent bills went unpaid, the college gradually slipped into debt.

In time strong opposition to Craven arose in the North Carolina Conference, and during the last few years of his life it caused a decline in the college enrollment.[19] In 1874 Craven's enemies succeeded in getting a minority report of their dissatisfaction recorded in the minutes of the board of trustees. They questioned Craven's selection and organization of the faculty and the curriculum. Opposition to Craven hampered efforts to raise money for the school.

Craven's supporters prevailed. The *Raleigh Christian Advocate* for June 11, 1873 declared that the "energy, tact and talent of Dr. Craven" had carried the college successfully through the years. He was still president when he died suddenly November 7, 1882, a few days prior to the annual meeting of the North Carolina Conference.

Viewed in retrospect, Craven may have been to Trinity College what George Washington was to the American Colonies during the Revolution. Military students agree that Washington was not a great general, but even so he was the one indispensable man in the struggle for American independence. Notwithstanding sharp criticism, open opposition, and seemingly insurmountable odds, Washington somehow managed to keep some kind of an army in the field for eight years and finally won the war. So Craven in spite of opposition, lack of money, and many discouragements, managed to keep his school going for forty years, during which time it won enough loyalty and support in the conference and among alumni and friends to assure its perpetuity.

For several years after Craven's death Trinity College had a hard time. During 1886-1887 three laymen were in charge, but its financial condition showed little improvement. Then John F. Crowell, a capable young man from the north, was, on recommendation of a friend in the University at Chapel Hill, elected president.

Demonstrating tact and skill, Crowell soon convinced a majority of the preachers in the conference that the college had no future in rural Randolph County and that it should be moved to the environs of a city. Over some opposition, the conference duly voted to move the college to Raleigh. Before the transfer could be effected, Washington Duke, a tobacco manufacturer who was a loyal Methodist layman, offered $100,000 if the college would come to Durham. Raleigh then released the conference from its pledge, and the institution went to Durham in 1892.

Washington Duke continued to give liberally to Trinity College until his death in 1905. After his passing his two sons, Benjamin N. and James B., who were rapidly amassing great wealth, gave regularly to the institution.

The contributions of the Duke family, along with continued support from the two conferences, caused Trinity College to prosper both materially and academically. In 1897 women were admitted and twelve promptly enrolled. Later a coordinate woman's college was established. By 1902 the endowment of the college was yielding $31,000 per year.

North Carolina Methodists became proud of their number one college. The eastern conference journal for 1901 said, "We hail with delight the continued prosperity of Trinity College," and in 1902 the conference "boldly challenged comparison of Trinity with any college in the land." In 1907 the Carnegie Board in New York ranked Trinity as second only to Vanderbilt University in its entrance requirements.

In 1910 William Preston Few, scholar, able administrator, and dedicated Methodist layman, became president of Trinity College. In time he developed rapport with James B. Duke who became a trustee of the college in 1914. In a forceful letter to Duke in 1918, Few pointed out that the ever-improving conditions in the Methodist Church in North Carolina were attributable to a significant degree to Trinity College which furnished most of the preachers in the state and was an inspiration to the church. Few declared the strength of the church was inescapably tied to the ability of Trinity College "to keep pace with the growing needs of a growing section of the country in a time of rapid change."[20]

James B. Duke was impressed by Few's explanation of the key importance of Trinity College for the Methodist Church and its ministers in whose welfare Duke was much interested, as had been his father before him.

In 1919 Duke gave Few some idea of what he intended to do. Over the next five years the two men conferred several times, and Few made some suggestions which Duke approved. It was Few who devised the plan for Duke University with Trinity College at its heart, and he suggested a separate corporation to control the endowment of the institution if Duke and his lawyer did not think it could be administered under the charter of Trinity College. Few further advised that some income from the endowment should be used to assist with the building of rural Methodist churches and supplementing the pastors' salaries.

Convinced of the importance of Trinity College for the Methodist Church, and aware of its potential for service to the church, the state, and the region, in 1924 James B. Duke set up the Duke Endowment of $40,000,000 and Trinity College as its principal beneficiary immediately became Duke University. The forty-million-dollar perpetual trust was more than doubled by the terms of Duke's will when he died in October 1925.

Thus the neighborhood school which began nearly a century before in Randolph County as a cooperative venture of the Methodists and Quakers, which grew into a college that was adopted by the North Carolina Conference, and which led a precarious financial existence for decades before its removal to Durham, was at last made financially secure and was lifted to the status of a university which, while still allied with the Methodist Church, had good prospects for becoming one of the great higher educational institutions in America and indeed the world.

In 1974, one half century after James B. Duke created the Duke Endowment, the statistics pertaining to Duke University were impressive: students (graduate students included) 8,252, faculty 847, budget expenditures for the year $48,603,735, and endowment $113,316,673.

As the years passed, Greensboro College experienced even greater financial difficulty than Trinity. By 1882 its condition was so critical that a group of laymen stepped in and bought it to prevent its financial failure. It continued under private control until 1903 when its condition was so desperate the stockholders decided to sell the property. Alumnae and friends then intervened and raised enough money to save the college and restore it to the two Methodist conferences. During the years the school was in private hands, the conference journals noted the situation, adding that it had always been closely allied with Methodism and was therefore endorsed and recommended.

II

Consider now the additional colleges which were founded or adopted by the two North Carolina conferences through the years. Brief accounts of the institutions, including the ones which did not survive, are in order.[21] Because of Methodist unification in 1939, we must also take note of two colleges founded by the former North Carolina Methodist Protestant Conference and two which began under the auspices of the former Methodist Episcopal Church.[22]

The Methodist colleges which existed for a time in this state and then passed from the scene are Carolina and Littleton in the North Carolina Conference; Davenport, Rutherford, and Weaver in the Western North Carolina Conference; and Yadkin in the former Methodist Protestant Church.

The 1912 conference journal noted that Carolina College at Maxton had opened. Thereafter it was owned and controlled by the conference. The school was allocated $2,000 of some $15,000 assessed for higher education in the conference year 1912-1913. Failing to attract a large enrollment, it was soon reduced to junior college rank. It did not prosper, and in 1928 the conference sold the buildings for $35,000 to a man who proposed to use them for a Presbyterian boys' school.

Littleton College at Weldon began as Central Institute in 1882 and was chartered as Littleton Female College in 1887. Though privately owned, it was regarded as a Methodist college and accounts of its progress appeared regularly in the conference journal. J. M. Rhodes, a conference member, bought the college in 1887 and operated it for the next thirty-two years. In 1905 it reported 22 officers and teachers and 237 students. The college was destroyed by fire in 1919 and was not rebuilt.

A small day school which began following a camp meeting in Caldwell County in 1858, grew into a high school by 1881, and became Davenport College for women at Lenoir in 1901. The building was destroyed by fire in 1877 and was partially rebuilt the next year. Semi-independent from the beginning, the school was given to the conference in 1883. In 1933 the conference, convinced that it must reduce the number of its junior colleges, voted to merge Davenport with Greensboro College. As time passed the merger seemed unfeasible, and in 1938 Davenport College ceased to exist.

Rutherford, a two-year college, began as Old Hollow School in Burke County in 1853. It was some ten miles from the nearest

town. Chartered as Rutherford Academy in 1858, it became Rutherford Seminary in 1861, and Rutherford College in 1870. Prior to the latter date the school was within the bounds of the South Carolina Conference, and during that time it trained a number of preachers for that body. In 1905 the Western North Carolina Conference confirmed the college's ten trustees. In 1920 the institution reported 231 students, 45 of them ministerial candidates. When the conference closed it in 1933, its debts exceeded the value of its property by $30,000.

The school which finally became Weaver College began at Dry Ridge soon after the meeting of the Holston Conference there in 1836. A building called the Conference House was erected on the spot, and it housed a boarding school during the 1860's. Closed during the Civil War, it reopened in 1866. It was destroyed by fire in 1872 and was rebuilt and chartered as Weaverville College the next year. Ten years later the college was deeded to the Holston Conference. The name was changed to Weaver College in 1912, and at that time it became a two-year school. Weaver was a strong and influential college in its region. The conference closed it in 1934 and used its assets to help establish Brevard Junior College.

Yadkin Institute, eight miles west of Lexington, was chartered in 1853 and rechartered as a college in 1861. It closed that very year because sixty of its eighty students left to join the Confederate Army. Reopening in 1867, it operated as an academy six years before again essaying college status. Women were admitted in 1878. In 1895 the conference instructed the trustees to ask the legislature to annul the college charter, and it ruled that thereafter the institution should be called Yadkin High School. When the school closed in 1924 it was said that the leading ministers of the Methodist Protestant Conference and many of the denomination's leading laymen had been educated there.

In addition to Duke University and its Duke Divinity School, the Methodist institutions of higher learning now functioning within the bounds of the North Carolina Conference are Louisburg, Methodist, and North Carolina Wesleyan colleges.

What is now Louisburg College was chartered as Franklin Academy in 1797 and was later called Louisburg Female Seminary. It was given to the conference in 1907. Since it was burdened with a debt of $146,000 during the depression of the 1930's, there was strong sentiment in the conference for allowing the trustees to do with it as they thought best. But finally the conference loaned the college $75,000 from its orphanage fund and it survived. Later it

admitted men, and after World War II it became a strong junior college.

Methodist at Fayetteville and North Carolina Wesleyan at Rocky Mount were established as four-year colleges in 1957. They constituted by far the most ambitious undertaking in higher education ever attempted by an annual conference in this state. Several factors made the ventures seem feasible to the conference.

The 1956 General Conference called on the church for a quadrennial emphasis on higher education. The nation-wide surge of interest in college training following World War II had greatly increased college attendance, and there seemed to be a need for more institutions of higher learning. Since the conference had only a junior college aside from Duke University and its Divinity School, it seemed in order to start at least one new four-year college.

Bishop Paul N. Garber, president of the conference, favored the establishment of one or more new colleges. Enthusiasm developed. Fayetteville and Rocky Mount, each hoping to be chosen as the seat of the new college, if there was to be only one, offered land and substantial amounts of money.[23] When the conference met to decide on a location, there was strong sentiment for establishing a new college in each city. Arguments were advanced to the effect that each municipality would support a college, that the Federal government would loan money at low interest for buildings, and that therefore the conference could and should project two new schools. It so voted. Pleased with what had been done, the conference quadrennial commission on higher education declared the North Carolina Conference felt it was "divinely called and set apart" to "become the pace setter for Methodism" in establishing "new institutions of learning."

Aware that much money would be needed to launch two new colleges, the conference put on two drives for capital funds, one for $5,000,000 in 1957, the other for $3,000,000 in 1962. The total collected was about $4,000,000. The colleges opened in 1958. They seemed to do well for several years.

The Methodist colleges now functioning within the bounds of the Western North Carolina Conference are Bennett, Brevard, Greensboro, High Point, and Pfeiffer.

Bennett College in Greensboro was founded in 1873 by the Freedmen's Aid Society. Nearly all of its students have been blacks. Coeducational until 1926, it was then reorganized as a woman's college. Because of substantial gifts from individuals and foundations, the college has a good plant and a modest endowment. It

was one of the first of the Negro colleges to meet the standards of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges. Since its trustees are elected by the Boards of Education and Global Ministries, it belongs to The United Methodist Church and not to any annual conference. However, it should be said that since 1968 both North Carolina conferences have been contributing modest amounts annually to the college. They assumed responsibility for the financial support the North Carolina-Virginia Conference was giving to Bennett before that body was absorbed due to the abolition of the Central Jurisdiction.

Brevard Junior College was established by the conference in 1934 after it had voted to close Davenport, Rutherford, and Weaver colleges. Of the five Methodist colleges within its bounds today, Brevard is the only one solely owned by the Western North Carolina Conference. For many years prior to 1934 the Woman's Missionary Society of the M. E. Church, South operated what was called Brevard Institute for mountain youths. On learning of the conference's plan for launching a new junior college, the Woman's Missionary Council offered and the conference accepted the buildings and grounds of the Institute for the new college. During the years the conference and interested individuals have contributed substantial amounts to the college. Today it has a good plant and some endowment. The new institution soon enrolled more students than its predecessor colleges combined.

High Point College is, to use Carlyle's figure of speech, largely the lengthened shadow of one man, Joseph F. McCulloch (1856-1934). A native of Guilford County, McCulloch served a few years as president of Adrian College in Michigan. He returned to North Carolina about 1890 with the aim of persuading his fellow Methodist Protestants to build a college. In Greensboro he soon established the paper which became the *Methodist Protestant Herald,* often using its columns to emphasize the need of a denominational college in the state. It is claimed that as a result of McCulloch's continual emphasis, higher education was discussed at each succeeding session of the Methodist Protestant Conference until High Point College was established in 1924. The men's dormitory at the college is named for McCulloch. In a few years the school had over 400 students, and by the time of Methodist unification in 1939 it was said that almost half of the ministers of the conference had been educated at the college.

Pfeiffer College began as the Emily Pruden School near Lenoir in 1885. In 1903 Miss Pruden deeded it to the Woman's Home

Missionary Society of the M. E. Church. In 1910 it was moved to Meisenheimer. In 1928 it added two years of college work. The name was changed to Pfeiffer Junior College in 1935, honoring the Henry Pfeiffers of New York whose gifts made possible five buildings. It became a senior college in 1954. In 1961 the Western North Carolina Conference voted to sponsor the college and extend financial support in a cooperative arrangement with the Woman's Division of Christian Service and the conference Woman's Society. The two organizations agreed to appropriate $30,000 and $28,000, respectively, for ten years. At that time the college had an enrollment of over 700, and it has done well except for incurring rather heavy indebtedness.

III

Since theological training is a phase of higher education, it is in order to touch on what North Carolina Methodism has done in this field.

As already indicated, the M. E. Church was opposed to theological schools until after 1840, and prejudice against them continued longer in Southern Methodism. Attempts to persuade the 1866 and 1870 General Conferences to found a theological school failed. When Vanderbilt University opened in 1875 it had a Biblical Department which was Southern Methodism's first seminary. However, young ministers were not encouraged to attend, and by 1900 only 71 students had been granted Bachelor of Divinity degrees at Vanderbilt. The General Conference did not recognize the Biblical Department until 1894, and no assessment was placed on the church for its support until 1910.

The loss of Vanderbilt in 1914 by a court decision seemed to awaken the denomination to the importance of theological education. It immediately launched Emory and Southern Methodist universities, each with a theological school attached.

When Trinity College became Duke University, it was taken for granted that it would include a theological seminary. The Duke Divinity School, then called the Duke School of Religion, opened in November 1926, and, like its sister schools at Emory and Southern Methodist universities, soon became one of the strongest seminaries in the denomination and indeed in the nation.

The two North Carolina conferences did not supply the money to establish Duke Divinity School. Moreover, the seminary, like the university, is recognized as a regional institution, drawing many students from distant states and foreign countries. Yet because of

the location of the Divinity School, the number of its graduates who serve in the two conferences, and the sizeable amounts of money the conferences contribute to the institution and its students every year, it is fair to say that Duke Divinity School is in a real sense North Carolina Methodism's theological seminary.

For many years the majority of the preachers joining the two North Carolina conferences have received their seminary training at Duke. One dean of the school has been elected to the episcopacy. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of Duke Divinity School for North Carolina Methodism.

The contributions of the two conferences to theological education have not been limited to Duke Divinity School. Through the years some support has been given to Candler School of Theology. In 1964 the Southeastern Jurisdictional Conference adopted the "one per cent plan," asking each church to give each year of the quadrennium an amount equal to one percent of its budget for ministerial education. Both North Carolina conferences participated in the plan.

In 1974 the two conferences apportioned a total of nearly $300,000 for ministerial education.

IV

Through the years the North Carolina conferences have given some support to Negro higher education. Since Bennett College belonged to the M. E. Church until 1939 and is still related directly to the denomination and not to one or more annual conferences, the two conferences have understandably not felt responsible for its support. However, after Methodist unification, Bennett received help from their Race Relations Day offerings. In 1968 that offering totaled about $14,000 in the two conferences. Also, as already indicated, when the North Carolina-Virginia Conference was absorbed, the two conferences agreed to appropriate around $12,000 per year for Bennett, the amount the black conference had been supplying. By 1974 they had increased the budget item for Bennett College to about $20,000 per year.

Paine College, Augusta, Georgia, was established jointly by the C. M. E. Church and the M. E. Church, South in 1882 for the education of Negro youths. At the outset the white denomination assumed some responsibility for the school. The administrative and teaching staffs were integrated from the beginning. For decades representatives, usually black, of the college were regularly wel-

comed at M. E. Church, South annual conferences and permitted to take offerings for the institution.

In 1885 a representative of the C. M. E. Church attended the North Carolina Conference and was invited to address the body and take an offering for Paine Institute, as it was then called. But though the visiting brethren were always allowed to take freewill offerings, it does not appear that the white conferences assessed their districts for specified amounts for Paine College as they did for their own schools.

The 1972 General Conference established the Black College Fund, and quotas were assigned to the annual conferences. In response to that emphasis the two North Carolina conferences are now giving substantially more support to Negro higher education than in the past. In 1974 they apportioned a total of some $231,000 for the Black College Fund.

V

Campus ministry, that is, the special service the conferences provide for Methodist students in state and non-Methodist private institutions of higher learning, is an important part of the record.

The Methodists built a church adjoining the University at Chapel Hill in 1853, but for decades little if anything was said about the need of a specialized ministry to Methodist students. Perhaps one reason was that for many years the great majority of college students were in church and private institutions. But after World War I when the student bodies at Chapel Hill and what was then called the Woman's College at Greensboro quickly rose to around 3,000 and 2,000, respectively, one third of them Methodists, it became obvious that the churches adjoining the campuses must have the help of student pastors and youth workers if they were to reach and adequately minister to the Methodist students.

Moreover, since religion could not be taught in state schools, there arose a demand for the denominations to provide off-campus courses on the Bible and religion. As a result rather strong interdenominational schools of religion soon developed around some state universities, notably in Illinois, Missouri, and Texas. Methodism began such a venture at Chapel Hill in 1926, but for lack of funds it soon failed. Later the University itself arranged to offer nondenominational courses on the Bible and religion.

Prior to World War I the church at Chapel Hill and the Spring Garden Street Church across the way from the Woman's College in Greensboro had small edifices which had already become inade-

quate for Sunday worship, to say nothing of the fact that they had few or no facilities for a special ministry to students.

Thus when the conferences became concerned about what is now called campus ministry, the first need was appropriate physical plants at Chapel Hill and Greensboro. Spring Garden changed its name to College Place Church and went in debt some $40,000 to erect a sanctuary that would seat 600 or more, the laymen believing the conferences would soon give assistance. As it turned out they had to struggle with the debt until 1940 before the conferences appropriated enough money to liquidate it.

With a small local membership the Chapel Hill Church could not build physical facilities for 1,000 Methodist students without substantial outside help. Therefore the conferences had to initiate and undergird the building program at the seat of the University of North Carolina.[24]

In 1920 the eastern conference board of church extension reported it was prepared to appropriate $10,000 for building a representative church at Chapel Hill, that it had conferred with the conference board of missions, and that both boards were willing to meet with the corresponding agencies of the western conference to consider the matter.

In 1921 the two conferences set up a joint commission to build a one hundred fifty thousand dollar church at Chapel Hill to be paid for as follows: the conference boards of missions $40,000, the boards of church extension $20,000, the general board of church extension $20,000, the Chapel Hill community $20,000, and alumni $50,000.

Walter Patten, the energetic pastor sent to Chapel Hill in 1923 to build the church, soon developed plans for an impressive edifice that would cost over $300,000. It was decided that by postponing the erection of one wing the rest of the structure could be built for some $220,000. The conference boards supplied $60,000 as promised, and the general boards $50,000. The joint commission then urged that alumni and friends come forward with $110,000. In 1925 a contract for $237,000 was let, and the structure, except for the postponed wing, was completed in 1926. In 1927 the commission reported expenditures of $231,000 and a debt of $69,000 which soon rose to $72,000.

The great economic depression set in, and over the next seven years several unsuccessful plans were devised for paying the debt at Chapel Hill. One proposal adopted by the conferences called

for a laymen's organization with district leaders and a key person in each church to raise money. Only pittances were collected.

Creditors demanded payment. The matter became serious. When the writer arrived in Chapel Hill in November 1931 to assume the pastorate, he found a letter on his desk from the Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Company saying it intended to foreclose the mortgage and sell the church. Possibly Methodism would have lost the magnificent colonial style church at Chapel Hill if the insurance company could have found a buyer.

In December 1934, a wealthy alumnus in Winston-Salem who was a Methodist and who preferred to remain anonymous, gave $50,000 toward the Chapel Hill Church debt. The conference boards quickly appropriated the balance needed, and the indebtedness which had hung like an incubus over University Church for seven years was lifted. After World War II, the education wing was built, thus completing the structure as planned.

During the depression years the conference boards appropriated small amounts toward the salary of the pastor at Chapel Hill, but nothing for student work as such. In 1936 each conference allocated $1,700 for what is now called campus ministry.

During and after World War II conference funds for campus ministry became more plentiful. An interconference commission on college and university religious work was organized. A state director with an office in Greensboro was appointed for the Methodist student movement of North Carolina. In 1962 the commission reported that some work was being done among students on more than a score of campuses. There were Wesley Foundation boards of directors at nineteen institutions.

In 1974 the two conferences appointed eight conference members as directors of Wesley Foundations, chaplains, campus ministers, or directors of student activities at the state institutions of higher learning in Boone, Chapel Hill, Cullowhee, Greenville, Pembroke, Raleigh, Rockingham, and Winston-Salem. In the same year they appropriated some $124,000 and $66,000 for campus ministry, respectively.

The campus ministry supported by the conferences is helpful to hundreds if not thousands of students in the state institutions of higher education. And it should be noted that the investment of the conferences in this ministry is not a one way street. Many students influenced by the campus ministry are from deeply loyal Methodist homes, and some of them go into full time Christian service on finishing college. A number of ministers in the two

conferences today are graduates of state institutions of higher education. The present minister to Duke University is a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

VI

Other factors in the story of North Carolina Methodism and higher education merit attention. One of them is the conviction of the conferences from the beginning to the present that they must maintain and operate colleges.

Reports on education in the conference journals often say or assume that the church cannot leave the education of its young people entirely to the state, that it must provide opportunities for education under church auspices. The 1892 western conference journal says, "Christian education is essential to Christian civilization. The state as such is incompetent to the task. A purely secular education neither does nor can convert any one, and to the extent that it separates man from God, it is an unmitigated curse. The church must therefore make adequate provision for the proper education of her sons and daughters, or turn them over to the tender mercies of a Christless and soulless culture." The next year the report on education observed that from the beginning education in North Carolina had been provided chiefly by the church and by private enterprise under the endorsement and support of the church, and the conference did not believe it was the will of the church or a wise statecraft to transfer education wholly to the state.

The conferences believed church colleges were needed to protect young people from deceptively false views of life and reality. In 1881 the conference opposed schools that "do not foster the priceless principles of Christian faith and hope," and said there was "a peculiar tendency of much higher education of this age to magnify beyond all consistency, merely intellectual and esthetical culture, and to throw the deceitful glamor of a vain philosophy over the unsettled hypotheses of incomplete science." Therefore, "it behooves the church to make unprecedented struggles to shield her children from dangers that threaten them." "Our people are awaking to the fact that it is the business of the church to educate her sons and daughters under Christian influences."

Also the conferences considered their colleges important for church strategy. They expected them to produce leaders, both lay and clerical, who could help the church to hold its own in the world. The 1885 journal says, "The church of the future will be

determined by the educational institutions which look to the perfection of character in the likeness of the Son of God." The 1890 western conference journal says, "In our view the educational interest of the church is vital to its future growth and triumph, and the time has come when we cannot afford to let it occupy a subordinate position in the thought of our people." The 1900 eastern conference journal said flatly, "The church must educate or die."

Statements in recent conference journals concerning the importance of church colleges may be more sophisticated, but they are no less emphatic. In 1961 the eastern conference commission on higher education observed that 8,000 Methodist youths were attending state institutions of higher learning, and it wondered "if we are doing our duty in helping to direct these young people to our Methodist colleges. . . . We should never cease to emphasize that education which is Christian specializes in something more than the mental and physical. . . . Social and spiritual values [are] emphasized and nurtured in our Methodist colleges."

In 1972 the two conferences set up a joint higher education planning and strategy committee which devoted three years to the study of the church's involvement in higher education in this state. The committee's report says church colleges are as important as ever if not more so. The committee began its work with a "deep conviction that a Christian liberal education is an adventure of both the mind and the spirit. . . . It is the Christian liberal tradition in education which must make sure that faith has a chance—that faith as well as reason, has an opportunity to make its contribution to the ceaseless human struggle to break the bonds of ignorance. Reason alone is not enough." The committee declared it "stands firmly on the belief that the Judaeo-Christian approach to values and to concepts of man can exist in a valid relationship with the most rigorous sort of intellectual activity, and that the Judaeo-Christian faith in a supreme being provides the initiative for the belief that there is a divine dimension to human personality." "There are both theological and ethical reasons for Christian higher education. Theologically, Christian colleges foster belief that God is truth and that the freedom to seek and honor truth is faithful service to God. Ethically, Christian colleges serve human needs, enrich life, and seek to foster the well-being of society."

In 1972 the chairman of the higher education division of the conference board of education said the commission and the board had "come to the distinct conclusion that these colleges represent a marvelous opportunity for the extension of our church and the

Christian heritage." Noting that some were asking how the conference could get out of a vast commitment to higher education, he said, "There seems to be a stronger voice saying that we must save our colleges and utilize them for the church far more effectively" than in the past.

Thus there has been and there still is a deep-rooted conviction that the church must maintain and operate colleges.

VII

The cooperation of the two North Carolina conferences in supporting higher education should be noted. When the western conference was organized in 1890 it immediately accepted responsibility for half the amount to be raised that year for Trinity College. Since there had been for years state-wide Methodist loyalty to both Greensboro and Trinity colleges, perhaps cordial cooperative support was to be expected. But was that the full explanation?

In 1911 the western conference voted to put on a campaign for $150,000 for its schools, and it allocated $25,000 each to Davenport, Rutherford, and Weaver Colleges, $18,000 to Trinity College, and only $11,960 to Greensboro College! At the time Trinity, due to regular and special gifts from the Duke family, was in better financial condition than Greensboro College! But whatever the explanation of what happened in 1911, to this day both conferences have equal representation on the boards of trustees of Duke University and Greensboro College and both contribute money annually to Greensboro College and Duke Divinity School.

In 1944 the two conferences adopted identical resolutions committing them to planned cooperation in support of higher education. They proposed to agree on which institutions each conference would support individually and which jointly. They arranged to join in a campaign to be called the Methodist College Advance; it was to emphasize the contribution of the colleges and raise money for them. The next year they united in a campaign to raise $2,075,000 for the colleges, the conference quotas being $1,245,000 and $875,000. Each conference raised about half of its allotment.

In 1948 the two conferences set up the Methodist College Foundation of North Carolina, Inc. Its personnel included the two bishops, all the college presidents and trustees, and five ministers and five laymen from each district. The foundation was expected to stimulate interest in the colleges, raise money for them, and relate them effectively to the church. The participating institutions were Brevard, Greensboro, High Point, and Louisburg col-

leges, Duke University, and any new colleges which might be established.

In 1950 the two conferences launched on a 60 to 40 basis a campaign for $2,500,000 for the colleges. Amounts allocated to the institutions were Brevard $700,000, Greensboro $600,000, High Point $500,000 for buildings and $300,000 for endowment, and Louisburg $250,000 for buildings and $150,000 for endowment. The Methodist College Foundation was to spearhead the campaign. Over the next five years about fifty per cent of the amount sought was collected.

In 1957 cooperation between the two conferences in support of higher education was partially interrupted. The western body adopted a report of its quadrennial commission on higher education which observed that the two conferences had been raising educational funds on a 60 to 40 basis, and then added, "We deem it advisable for the two respective annual conferences to promote each its own campaign for capital funds, and that our contributions be made to those institutions with which we have been historically related." Translated that action meant the western conference had decided that with four colleges of its own to support it was unwilling to accept joint responsibility for two new four-year colleges in the east. Later the Methodist College Foundation was abolished.

Regardless of differing views about the advisability of establishing new colleges, both conferences still felt the need of some cooperation in the cause of higher education. In 1967 an interconference consultation committee on higher education was set up. The group met in Greensboro February 7, 1968, considered interconference campus ministry relationships and the joint ownership of Greensboro and High Point colleges, and then recommended cooperation between the two conferences.

In 1969 the two conferences established a regional commission on Christian higher education and campus ministry. The commission proposed a bishops' conference to consider problems and promises of higher educational interests common to the two conferences.

In 1972 the bishops' conference was arranged with the understanding that it would try to clarify the role of the church college in relation to the church and society, examine the facts regarding present conditions of the Methodist colleges in the state, and consider plans and options for the future which might be feasible for the colleges in the two conferences.

Citing the need for the bishops' conference, the 1972 western conference board of education report mentioned decreasing college enrollments, rising costs, and changing patterns of giving, and said they were forcing the church to reexamine and possibly redefine its priorities in the area of higher education.

The bishops' conference called for, and the two conferences authorized, a joint higher education planning and strategy committee to make a study of the Methodist colleges in the state and recommend appropriate action. The joint committee labored three years and presented a one hundred eighty-eight-page report to the two conferences in June 1975. Among other things, the committee advised the conferences and the colleges to work together as they try to solve their problems in the area of higher education.

Thus cooperation between the conferences in higher education seems to be important.

VIII

When one considers Methodism and higher education in North Carolina or elsewhere in the land, it appears that from the beginning to the present the one constant and urgent need of the colleges is more money. With few exceptions it has never been possible for church and private colleges to charge students more than one-third to two-thirds of what it costs to educate them. Of course the money problems of state-owned institutions of higher learning are usually not acute because their deficits can be made up by taxation. The extra money needed by the church colleges must be collected from some source if they are to survive. In the early years of Trinity College the important supplementary cash came in part, as we have seen, from the stipends of the president and the professors.

Every journal of the North Carolina conferences from 1838 to the present contains a serious report on education. The accounts usually include, among other matters, references to higher education and the need of more money for the conference colleges. The early journals show that continually the districts were assessed definite amounts for the conference educational institutions, the presiding elders and district stewards determining how much was to be asked of each charge. Usually the amounts assessed were not as much as the schools asked or needed, and the total collected was rarely as much as had been assessed.

Through the years the need of the conference colleges for more money than they get has been so urgent that perhaps presidents

and boards of trustees have often thought they had few if any problems that could not be solved if their institutions could be assured of adequate financial resources.

The action of the 1894 General Conference in creating the General Board of Education and authorizing the appointment of a secretary of education without salary in each annual conference was helpful to the cause of higher education throughout the church. In 1898 the General Board projected with General Conference approval what it called the twentieth century education fund, a plan which assessed each annual conference one dollar for every church member, the money to be used for conference colleges and the endowment of Vanderbilt University. Within two years the Western North Carolina Conference had raised $25,000 of its quota of $70,000 for the twentieth century fund. In 1906 the General Board assessed the church at large $50,000 for what it called educational expansion.

In 1921 the M. E. Church, South put on its most ambitious financial campaign for education, asking the annual conferences to raise $33,000,000 for the denomination's schools, colleges, and universities. The amount to be allotted to each educational institution was announced in advance. For the colleges in North Carolina it was to be several hundred thousand dollars each. Both conferences accepted their campaign quotas of $1,607,300 and $1,322,700.

Unfortunately the grand effort for the financial undergirding of the denomination's educational institutions came immediately after the church-wide high pressure centenary drive for missions. It was therefore an anti-climax and less than a pronounced success. The two North Carolina conferences raised a little less than twenty-five per cent of their combined quotas. But of course the money received was helpful to the colleges.

Beginning in the 1940's and continuing to the present, the two conferences have prosecuted several large financial campaigns for their colleges, some jointly and some separately. In 1957 while the eastern conference was raising large sums for two new colleges, the western body projected a campaign for $3,330,000 to be allocated as follows: Brevard, Greensboro, and High Point colleges $850,000 each, Duke Divinity School $200,000, and the Wesley Foundations $200,000. About 65 per cent of the amount sought was collected.

In 1950 both conferences established what they called the college sustaining fund, a plan whereby each church was to give for higher education an amount equal to a specified percentage of its budget. At the beginning the amount was to be the equivalent of

three per cent of the pastor's salary and several budget items. According to the plan, as the pastors' salaries and other budget expenses increased, the churches would automatically contribute more for higher education.

The college sustaining fund plan has worked well. The churches are giving more proportionately for higher education than in the past.

According to the General Board of Education in Nashville, the Charlotte Area which is the Western North Carolina Conference, is giving more annually per church member—$2.99—for higher education than any other area in the connection. The North Carolina Conference is contributing $2.37 per member. In 1974 that conference raised $640,000 for higher education, and the western conference contributed $1,130,482.

Prior to 1940 the sum of $1,770,000 distributed among the Methodist colleges in North Carolina would probably have relieved the presidents and trustees of all financial worries. But alas in these days of continuing inflation, accelerating costs, and decreasing enrollments, the colleges must have still more money if they are to carry on and maintain high rating as educational institutions.

IX

On balance North Carolina Methodism's record in higher education in the last two hundred years is commendable. In 1780 with John Dickins leading, Methodism in this state aspired to build a "Kingswood school." In 1830 while linked to the Virginia Conference, North Carolina Methodism helped to found the denomination's oldest permanent college in America. In 1838 at its first session, the North Carolina Conference took steps to establish in Greensboro the nation's second oldest permanent college for women. In 1857 the conference adopted Trinity College and managed to sustain it through thirty-five years of poverty and discouragement until its permanence was made relatively certain by the philanthropy of Washington Duke.

In 1924 Trinity College became the beneficiary of the great fortune of James B. Duke, was lifted to the status of a university with an outstanding divinity school, and during the last half century has achieved distinction in the academic world, rendered notable service to the church, and exercised praiseworthy leadership in the region and beyond.

Across the years Methodism in North Carolina established six colleges which did not survive. However, in the aggregate they

served Methodism and the commonwealth some 287 years before they passed from the scene. Many ministers and men and women of the laity who received their education in those institutions rendered incalculable service to church and state in their day.

In 1975 United Methodism in North Carolina had, aside from Duke University and Duke Divinity School, eight colleges, all of them accredited by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, and by the University Senate. In 1974 these eight institutions had a total enrollment of 5,608 students, 395 full time faculty members, operating budgets that totaled $17,182,288, endowments in the amount of $16,880,015, and physical plants worth about $50,000,000. These colleges obviously represent a large investment in human and material resources, and they are without doubt exercising leadership and rendering worthy service in church and state.

Of course the colleges today have problems, but they have always had them. They are costly to the conferences in these days of inflation, but they have always been so. If they are to continue as quality educational institutions, it appears that they will cost the conferences even more in the years ahead.

It is possible that some of the eight Methodist colleges now operating in North Carolina will disappear sooner or later by merger or otherwise.[25] The thoroughgoing report of the joint commission on strategy and planning mentioned above recommends cluster colleges and the possible merger of some institutions in the years ahead.

But regardless of the problems and difficulties which beset the Methodist colleges in this state, it does not appear that the conferences will abandon the field of higher education. The 1973 North Carolina Conference journal says, "We are in higher education because that is where tomorrow is" and because that "is where the action is." "Christian education emphasizes human dignity, . . . stimulates moral sensitivity, . . . and confronts us and our future with ultimate questions."

The 1974 Western North Carolina Conference journal cites a statement attributed to Raymond Bost, president of Lenoir Rhyne College, to the effect that a nation which is committed to free enterprise and healthy competition, needs, in view of the advent of the mass media and the tremendous impact they have had on our culture in the last twenty-five years, "an element within itself which can play the role of visionary thinker, warning prophet, and loving critic," and, said Bost, "I know of no agency in our society

better equipped to fulfill that goal than our privately controlled colleges and universities with their blended heritage of religion and learning."

Apparently North Carolina Methodism will persevere in the support of higher educational institutions because deep down it has a conviction that its colleges are important for the church itself, for the church's ministry to the rising generation, and for the church's proper influence on society.

Footnotes

Introduction — O. Kelly Ingram

1. L. S. Burkhead, editor, *Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina, Containing the History and Addresses Delivered at the first Centennial Mass-meeting Celebration, Held by order of the North Carolina Annual Conference, at Metropolitan Hall, in the City of Raleigh, N. C., March 21st to 26th, 1876.* (Published in Behalf of the Metropolitan M. E. Church, South, Raleigh, N. C., 1876), p. xxi.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.,* pp. xix, xx.
4. *Ibid.,* p. xvii.
5. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* (World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1929), p. 3.
6. *Ibid.,* p. 25.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.,* p. 29.
9. *Ibid.,* p. 31.
10. *Ibid.,* pp. 31-32.
11. *Ibid.,* pp. 3, 4.
12. *Ibid.,* p. 4.
13. *Ibid.,* p. 5.
14. *Ibid.,* pp. 5, 6.

Chapter One — Frank Baker

1. Lefler, Hugh T., and A. R. Newsome, *The History of a Southern State, North Carolina,* 3rd ed., Chapel Hill, U.N.C. Press, 1973, p. 77.
2. Nash, Francis, "The Borough Towns of North Carolina," *The North Carolina Booklet,* Vol. VI, No. 2, pp. 83-102 (Oct., 1906).
3. Manross, William W. (ed.), *The Fulham Papers in the Lambeth Palace Library,* Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1965, xi.134-5 (p. 181).
4. Pennington, Edgar L., *The Church of England and the Reverend Clement Hall in Colonial North Carolina,* Hartford, Conn., Church Missions Publishing Company, 1937, pp. 35-7. The Rev. John Garzia of Bath had died in 1744, and his place was not filled for a decade. Cf. Reed, C. Wingate, *Beaufort County,* Raleigh, Edwards and Broughton, 1962, p. 138.
5. Olds, Fred A., "The Parishes in North Carolina," *North Carolina Booklet,* Vol. XXI, Nos. 1-4 (1921-22), pp. 81-9.

6. Cheshire, Joseph Blount (ed.), *Sketches of Church History in North Carolina,* Wilmington, N. C., Rosset, 1892, p. 69. There was also a non-officiating clergyman on Cape Fear, Christopher Bevis.

7. At Skinnersville Chapel, Tyrell county (now Washington); see Cheshire, *op. cit.,* p. 214.

8. *The Diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards First Earl of Egmont,* London, Historical Manuscripts Commission, 3 vols., 1920-23, II.200.

9. *Ibid.,* II.312; cf. Wesley, John, *Letters,* ed. John Telford, London, Epworth Press, 8 vols., 1931, I.201-3.

10. Wesley, John, *Journal,* ed. N. Curnock, London, Epworth Press, 8 vols., 1938, I.252. This would probably be one of the "collection of tracts relating to Carolina" which the Earl of Egmont had sent out to Wesley April 5, 1736, with the request that he would annotate and return them (Egmont, *Diary,* II.255, 333).

11. Egmont, *Diary,* II.312-15; this was confirmed by the Presbyterian minister, the Rev. G. MacLeod, p. 317.

12. Baker, Frank, and George W. Williams (eds.), *John Wesley's First Hymnbook,* Charleston, The Dalcho Historical Society, 1964.

13. Whitefield, George, *Journals,* London, Banner of Truth Trust, 1960, pp. 373-81.

14. Whitefield, George, *Works,* London, Dilly, 7 vols., 1771-2, II.131-7.

15. *Ibid.,* III.317-8.

16. *Colonial Records of North Carolina,* Raleigh, Daniels, 1886-90, 10 vols., ed. W. L. Saunders, VII.104; Whitefield, *Works,* III.326.

17. *Ibid.,* VII.97-8.

18. *Ibid.,* VI.265, 565, 594-5, 1047-8, 1060-1. Cf. *The Carolina Back-country on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and other writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant,* ed. Richard J. Hooker, Chapel Hill, U.N.C. Press, 1953, pp. 20, 75, where Woodmason apparently used the term in the same way as Reed, and in the specific instance on p. 20 of a "Methodist" preacher in the back country of South Carolina rather than North. See also Asbury, Francis, *Journal and Letters,* ed. Elmer T. Clark, etc., 3 vols., Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1958, I.680, showing how in New England in 1791 Asbury said, "The New Light Baptists were very kind, and some of them appeared like Methodists."

19. On March 29, 1764, Governor Arthur Dobbs estimated 100,000 whites by multiplying the taxable males (those over sixteen) by four; there were also 10,000 taxable male and female Negroes; no estimate was made of Indians. He spoke of the population as "daily increasing" (*Colonial Records,* VI.1027, 1040). Cf. Lefler and Newsome, *op. cit.,* p. 78, and the differing figures in their Appendix, p. 715.

20. Nash, *op. cit.,* pp. 83-102.

21. He himself spelt his name in three different ways, but seemed to prefer this.

22. Maser, F. E., and Howard T. Maag (eds.), *The Journal of Joseph Pilmore,* Philadelphia, Historical Society of the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church, 1969, pp. 106-7; *Arminian Magazine,* London, Vol. VII, p. 224 (1784).

23. Pilmore, *Journal,* p. 134.

24. *Ibid.,* p. 169.

25. *Ibid.,* p. 171. He had actually passed through seven by modern reckoning—Currituck, Camden (formed 1777), Pasquotank, Perquimans, Chowan, Washington (then part of Tyrrell), and Beaufort.

26. *Ibid.,* pp. 172-5; cf. pp. 191-2.

27. *Ibid.,* p. 190.

28. *Ibid.,* pp. 156, 169, 171-2, 175, 190-1.

29. *Ibid.,* pp. 156-7, 166, 169.

30. *Ibid.,* p. 157. The researches of Rev. Denny C. Wise make it probable that this is to be identified with the present Mount Zion United Methodist Church, in Currituck, the southern peninsula of Currituck being known in the eighteenth century as "the Narrows." It might refer, however, to the Narrows in Pasquotank, near Elizabeth City, which would provide a likely occasion when the young man from Pasquotank could have heard Pilmore in that county (p. 170). For the Pasquotank Narrows see Griffin, William A., *Ante-Bellum Elizabeth City,* Elizabeth City, Roanoke Press, 1970, pp. 19-23. All recollection of such a chapel seems to have vanished, but cf. the two men who later waited on Pilmore with "an invitation to go and preach the gospel (? again, or regularly) at Pasquotank." (p. 163).

31. Pilmore, *Journal,* pp. 170-1.

32. *Ibid.,* p. 190.

33. *Ibid.,* pp. 176, 189.

34. *Ibid.,* p. 191.

35. Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Mitre and Sceptre,* New York, O.U.P., 1962, p. 322; cf. *Colonial Records,* VI.537, 553.

36. *Colonial Records,* VI.710, 1039; VII.102, 540-1; Pilmore, *Journal,* p. 169.

37. Whitefield, *Journals,* p. 386.

38. *Colonial Records,* VII.103; cf. *ibid.,* III.53; XXIII.605, 759-60.

39. Powell, William S., *St. Luke's Episcopal Church,* Salisbury, 1953, p. 3.

40. *Colonial Records,* XI.610-1.

41. *Ibid.,* VIII.51; Powell, *op. cit.,* p. 3; Cheshire, *op. cit.,* p. 229; Manross, *Fulham Papers,* pp. 304, 327-8.

42. *Colonial Records,* VIII.505-6; cf. Ramsay, Robert W., *Carolina Cradle: Settlement of the Northwest Carolina Frontier, 1747-1762,* Chapel Hill, U.N.C., 1964, p. 201.

43. Pilmore, *Journal,* pp. 172, 175, 190.

44. *Methodist Magazine,* New York, 1827, p. 78. This refers to "private members" in the colonies in general, but is surely true of North Carolina almost equally with others. Cf. Lee, Jesse, *A Short History of the Methodists in the United States of America,* Baltimore, Magill and Clime, 1810, p. 24, where he speaks of British Methodist immigrants before 1766 being "scattered about as sheep having neither fold nor shepherd."

45. Sweet, W. W., *Religion in Colonial America,* New York, Scribner's, 1953, p. 310. But compare Bucke, Emory Stevens (ed.), *The History of American Methodism,* 3 vols., Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1964, I.196, where it is demonstrated that the 1784 membership in Maryland was more than that in either Virginia or the Carolinas, and was still growing, though nothing like as rapidly as that in North Carolina.

46. See *The Life of the Reverend Devereux Jarratt . . . . Written by himself,* Baltimore, Warner and Hanna, 1806; Gewehr, Wesley M., *The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-90,* Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1930; and Morgan, Steven D., "Lighting the Fire of American Methodism: Devereux Jarratt's Fostering Relationship with the Early American Methodists," Seminary Award Term Paper, Duke Divinity School, 1973.

47. Asbury, *Journal,* I.208-9; cf. Lee, *History,* p. 43, quoting this same phrase.

48. Wesley, *Journal,* V.315-6; Pilmore, *Journal,* p. 25.

49. Gewehr, *op. cit.,* pp. 140-3; *Colonial Records,* IX.1003-04.

50. Asbury, *Journal,* I.164.

51. Lee, *History,* pp. 43-4, implying that Williams came into North Carolina "soon after" reaching Petersburg in the spring of 1773. On May 17, 1774, the Rev. C. E. Taylor complained about Jarratt's visits to North Carolina, though he had not yet come to his own parish, St. George's, Northampton county (*Colonial Records,* IX.1003-04).

52. *Minutes of the Methodist Conferences, annually held in America, from 1773 to 1794, inclusive,* Philadelphia, Tuckniss, 1795, especially pp. 66-70; Bucke, *American Methodism,* I.196.

53. Asbury, *Journal,* I.163, 190.

54. Wesley, *Letters,* VI.182.

55. Wesley, John, *A Brief Narrative of the Revival of Religion in Virginia,* London, Hawes, 1778, p. 28 (Asbury, *Journal,* I.220).

56. *Ibid.,* p. 29 (Asbury, *Journal,* I.220). One would also expect incursions into Northampton county, but these had not taken place in early 1774; see note 51.

57. Rankin, Thomas, manuscript journal, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Monday, May 20, 1776. Rankin and Shadford had come over from England together in 1773.

58. *Ibid.,* May 21, 1776.

59. *Minutes,* 1795, p. 18.

60. Rankin, Journal, May 27, 1776.

61. Wesley, *Brief Narrative,* pp. 33-4 (Asbury, *Journal,* I.222-3). The note on p. 223 of Asbury's *Journal* states that this Anglican chapel was on the Roanoke River near the Virginia-North Carolina border, but that conflicting evidence makes its identification uncertain. Rankin's manuscript journal (though not the *Brief Narrative*) makes it quite clear that although he was north of the Roanoke River he himself believed that he "preached at (what is called) Roanoke Chapel in North Carolina." (In the *Brief Narrative* the name is spelt "Ronoaky," an indication of the contemporary pronunciation.)

62. Rankin, Journal, July 23. The church may possibly have been Quankey Chapel, near the Quankey Creek between Roanoke Rapids and Aurelia Springs.

63. Asbury, *Journal,* I.50n.

64. *Ibid.,* I.105n.

65. *Ibid.,* I.29n.

66. Lee, *History,* p. 318; Lindsay returned to the Methodist itinerancy in Britain, and was stationed in various Irish circuits, 1778-87.

67. *Ibid.,* I.67n, where his national origin is left uncertain. Barclay, Wade Crawford, *Early American Methodism, 1769-1844,* 2 vols., New York, The Board of Missions and Church Extension of The Methodist Church, 1949-50, I.58n, states that Ruff, like Dromgoole and Glendenning, was a British immigrant, though he cites no authority.

68. Asbury, *Journal,* I.4n.

69. *A Short Account of the Christian Experience . . . of William Watters. Drawn up by himself,* Alexandria, Snowden, [1806], p. 30; cf. Asbury, *Journal,* I.76n.

70. Asbury, *Journal,* I.80n. His name is spelt variously in different primary sources.

71. *Ibid.,* I.358n.

72. *Ibid.,* I.170n.

73. Hard information about his national origin seems lacking.

74. Asbury, *Journal,* I.470-1; cf. I.299, 304, 347; III.28.

75. Watters, *Experience,* pp. 57, 69-70.

76. Lee, *History,* pp. 69-70; Sweet, William Warren, *Virginia Methodism,* Richmond, Whittet and Shepperson, [1955], pp. 79-86.

77. Asbury, *Journal,* I.300, 349, 352, 363. (Note his adverse reactions, however, to aristocratic traits in the clergy, *ibid.,* I.486-7.)

78. *Ibid.,* I.481.

79. Manross, William W., *A History of the American Episcopal Church,* New York, Morehouse-Gorham Co., 3rd ed., 1959, pp. 183-4.

80. Ahlstrom, Sydney E., *A Religious History of the American People,* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1972, pp. 368-9.

81. Cheshire, *op. cit.,* pp. 82-3, 265-6.

82. *Ibid.,* pp. 212-3, 261, 272.

83. *Ibid.,* pp. 182-208, 219-23, 231-41.

84. Asbury, *Journal,* III.28.

85. Cheshire, *op. cit.,* pp. 183-4, 258; *Methodist Magazine,* New York, 1826, pp. 335-7.

86. Cheshire, *op. cit.,* pp. 378-400.

87. Herman, Carl, *Religious Implications of the Carolina Charter of 1663,* Raleigh, Carolina Charter Tercentenary Committee, 1963.

88. In 1759 the churchwardens of Hanover county noted that their minister must "attend at six different places," though there was no church (*Colonial Records,* VI.59); in 1769 Hobart Briggs, the S.P.G. missionary for St. Gabriel's parish, Duplin County, seems to have had eight preaching places, but no building (*ibid.,* VIII.63); in 1771 Theodore Swaine Drage of St. Luke's parish, Rowan County, claimed forty small congregations, with no church building (*ibid.,* VIII.502-3). In 1760 the Rev. John McDowell complained to the S.P.G. about conditions in North Carolina, which contrasted with those even in Virginia or South Carolina, where the missionaries had "for the most part only two or three places to attend, and these not more than ten or twelve miles from the parsonage, and good churches or decent chapels to officiate in—but here our chapels, or rather people's houses where we are obliged to attend, are more than thirty, some of them forty, miles distant from the centre of the parish." (*Ibid.,* VI.236-7).

89. See above, notes 81, 82, 83.

90. Cheshire, *op. cit.,* pp. 181-8.

91. Asbury, *Jour*nal, I.439; Nash, Francis, *Hillsboro: colonial and revolutionary,* Raleigh, Edwards & Broughton, 1903, p. 9.

92. Asbury, *Journal,* I.210-2; Cheshire, *op. cit.,* pp. 210-2.

93. Smith, Stuart Hall, and T. Claiborne, *The History of Trinity Parish, Scotland Neck, Edgecombe Parish, Halifax County,* Scotland Neck, N. C., 1955, pp. 20-1.

94. Nash, *Hillsboro,* p. 9. Although a preference was given to the Episcopalians, the property eventually became Presbyterian (Lloyd, Pauline O. and Allen A., *History of the Churches of Hillsborough,* [1962], pp. 11-13, 60-1).

95. Pilmore, *Journal,* pp. 155, 166; Coke, Thomas, *Extracts of the Journals of the late Rev. Thomas Coke, L.L.D.,* Dublin, Napper, 1816, p. 59; Asbury, *Journal,* I.540.

N.B. The use of the term "chapel" by Pilmore, Coke, and Asbury (especially in his later years) seems normally to have implied a chapel of ease of the Church of England, as it did with Wesley. Undoubtedly, however, Asbury did use the term somewhat loosely, so that some of his references to chapels rather than to preaching houses or meeting houses must be treated as clues or confirmatory evidence rather than proof of their Anglican origin. Nor does the clear proof that Methodists indeed preached in a certain colonial chapel, even on a regular basis, necessarily imply that they had the exclusive use of it. Coke's *Journal* shows the need for caution on this point, for after naming a chapel which belonged to the Church of England he might add, "we do regular duty in it," or "we do duty in it whenever we please" (*op. cit.,* pp. 59, 61). For the Narrows Chapel see note 30 above.

96. Pugh, Jess Forbes, *Three Hundred Years along the Pasquotank,* Old Trap, Camden County, 1957, pp. 119-20.

97. Asbury, *Journal,* I.666, II.428.

98. Coke, *op. cit.*, p. 61; Asbury, *Journal*, II.188.

99. Asbury, *Journal*, I.561, II.188, 189, 533; *Historical Papers. Published by the Trinity College Historical Society and the North Carolina Conference Historical Society*, Series IX, 1912, p. 58.

100. Asbury, *Journal*, I.487, 510; Smith and Claiborne, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15; Rives, Ralph Hardee, *Historic Eden Methodist Church*, leaflet, n.d.

101. McRae, Stuart, *A Short History of Banks Methodist Church*, Wilton, N. C.; [1936?], pp. C-E (In "The Art of Cooking in Wilton," Banks Methodist M.Y.F., Wilton, N. C.)

102. Asbury, *Journal*, I.372, and local information through Rev. E. F. Bogie.

103. Coke, *op. cit.*, p. 61; Asbury, *Journal*, I.488.

104. Asbury, *Journal*, I.500; Muse, Amy, *The Story of the Methodists in the Port of Beaufort*, New Bern, Dunn, 1941, p. 14; Grissom, William Lee, *History of Methodism in North Carolina*, Nashville, Tenn., Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Publishing House, 1905, p. 149.

105. Asbury, *Journal*, I.487; cf. *Colonial Records*, IX.1022-3.

106. Cheshire, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-6.

107. Hill, Samuel S., Jr., *Religion and the Solid South*, Nashville, Tenn., Abingdon Press, 1972, pp. 147-51, 160, 166.

Chapter Two — Stuart C. Henry

1. George Lavington, *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists, Compar'd* (London, 1749-1751), I, Pt. I, 81-82.

2. *Ibid.*

3. Horace Walpole, *Correspondence with the Rev. William Cole* (New Haven, 1937), I, 134.

4. Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling* (New York, 1931), Bk. VIII, ch. viii, p. 350.

5. Samuel Foote, *The Dramatic Works of Samuel Foote* (London, 1788), I, 12.

6. George Otto Trevelyan, *The American Revolution, Part II* (New York, London and Bombay), II, 275.

7. George Whitefield, "Soul Prosperity," *Eighteen Sermons . . . Taken Verbatim in Short-Hand, and Faithfully Transcribed by Joseph Gurney* (Newburyport, 1797), p. 59.

8. Edward Deming Andrews, *The People Called Shakers* (New York, 1963), p. 224.

9. Jesse Lee, *A Short History of the Methodists* (Baltimore, 1810), p. 51.

10. Devereux Jarratt, *The Life of the Reverend Devereux Jarratt* (New York, 1969), p. 107.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

12. Francis Asbury, *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury* (London and Nashville, 1958), I, 208-209.

13. Thomas Southcliffe Ashton and Joseph Sykes, *The Coal Industry of the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester, 1929), p. 150.

14. Lee, *Short History*, p. 40.

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

17. H. T. Hudson, "Sketches of the Pioneer Methodists in North Carolina," *Raleigh Christian Advocate*, XXII, No. 15, April 12, 1876, p. 1.

18. Lee, *Short History*, p. 43.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

20. Joseph Pilmore, *The Journal of Joseph Pilmore* (Philadelphia, 1969), p. 15.

21. *Ibid.*

22. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
23. Lee, *Short History,* p. 28.
24. Pilmore, *Journal,* pp. 168-170.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
26. Joseph Judge, "Williamsburg, City for all Seasons," *National Geographic,* 134, No. 6, December, 1968, p. 808, indicates that the remedy is still for sale in Virginia.
27. Pilmore, *Journal,* p. 175.
28. W. L. Grisson, *History of Methodism in North Carolina* (Nashville and Dallas, 1905), I, 59.
29. John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley* (Grand Rapids, n.d.), XII, 331.
30. Pilmore, *Journal,* p. 206.
31. Asbury, *Journal,* I, 57.
32. *Ibid.*, I, 133.
33. *Ibid.*, II, 19.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Lee, *Short History,* p. 45.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
37. Pilmore, *Journal,* p. 206.
38. Charles Beecher, ed., *Autobiography, Correspondence, Etc., of Lyman Beecher, D.D.* (New York, 1865), I, 259.
39. Asbury, *Journal,* III, 547-548.
40. William Warren Sweet, *Methodism in American History* (New York and Nashville, 1953), p. 88.
41. Wesley, *Works,* XI, 24.
42. *Ibid.*, XII, 324.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
44. *Ibid.*, XI, 80.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
49. Sweet, *Methodism,* p. 81.
50. L. Tyerman, *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley* (New York, 1870), III, 199.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 198.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 200.
53. Sweet, *Methodism,* p. 90.
54. Leroy M. Lee, *The Life and Times of the Rev. Jesse Lee* (Richmond, 1848), pp. 88-91.
55. Wesley, *Works,* XI, 136.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 135.
58. Asbury, *Journal,* I, 263-264.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 440.
60. Lee, *Short History,* p. 70.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
63. Sweet, *Methodism,* p. 101. The earlier effort of the Methodists to secure establishment of the Church of England is recorded in *Journal of the House of Delegates of Virginia, 1776* (Richmond, 1828), under date of October 28, 1776.
64. William W. Bennett, *Memorials of Methodism in Virginia* (Richmond, 1871), p. 315.
65. Durward T. Stokes and William T. Scott, *A History of the Christian Church in the South* (n.p., 1973), p. 6.

66. *Ibid.*
67. Asbury, *Journal,* I, 365.
68. *Ibid.,* p. 488.
69. *Ibid.,* p. 620.
70. *Ibid.,* III, 81.
71. Lee, *Short History,* p. 180.
72. Asbury, *Journal,* I, p. 735.
73. *Ibid.,* p. 736.
74. Benjamin St. James Fry, *The Life of William M'Kendree* (New York, 1852), p. 30.
75. *Ibid.,* p. 32.
76. Lee, *Short History,* p. 351.
77. Minton Thrift, *Memoir of the Rev. Jesse Lee* (New York, 1823), p. 319.

Chapter Three — Larry E. Tise

1. *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years 1773-1845* (3 vols.; New York: Published by T. Mason and G. Lane, 1840), I, 7, 16, 38-9, 109-10, cited hereinafter as *Minutes.* Important for my perspective in this article is the general relationship of ideas, religion, and society in Linda K. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970).

2. Thomas Coke, "The Journal of Thomas Coke, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, September 18, 1784 to June 3, 1785," *The Arminian Magazine* (American), I (1789), 237-44. Lucius G. Matlack, *The History of American Slavery and Methodism, from 1780-1849* (New York: n.p., 1849), pp. 15-16.

3. W. L. Grissom, *History of Methodism in North Carolina, from 1772 to the Present Time* (vol. 1: Nashville: Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, 1905), pp. 111-14. Elmer T. Clark *et al.,* eds., *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury* (3 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), I, 358, 402, 423, cited hereinafter as Asbury, *Journal and Letters.*

4. *Minutes,* I, 7, 9, 12, 19. Grissom, *Methodism in N. C.,* pp. 44-108, *passim.*

5. *Minutes,* I, 38-9, 60-1, 118. Total figures for Methodists in North Carolina must be computed by combining all known circuits or districts in the state in the following years, 1780-1795, 1803-1836. Figures on membership were not compiled in 1802.

6. For discussions of the structure of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this period, see Frederick A. Norwood, *The Story of American Methodism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), pp. 119-32. See also, Larry E. Tise, *The Yadkin Melting Pot: Methodism and the Moravians in the Yadkin Valley, 1750-1850* (Winston-Salem: Clay Printing Co., 1967), pp. 50-1.

7. Asbury, *Journal and Letters,* I, 487, 509, 537, 595, 641, 671. Grissom, *Methodism in N. C.,* pp. 119-32.

8. The growth in structure and membership can best be traced in *Minutes,* I, 60-1, 86, 118, 258.

9. The foregoing calculations are by the author and are based on total reported membership in North Carolina for each year and related to total population figures for the state as reported in the dicennial census for 1790, 1800, 1810, and 1820.

10. Asbury, *Journal and Letters,* I, 357-72, *passim.*

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.,* pp. 620-23, 629-31, 641-42, 663-66, 671.

13. *Ibid.,* II, 224-27, 261-64, 278-79, 283-88, 289-90.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 627-28, 654-55, 662-63. William K. Boyd, "Methodist Expansion in North Carolina after the Revolution," *Historical Papers, Trinity College Historical Society*, ser. 12 (1916), 48-9.

15. Asbury, *Journal and Letters*, I, 364n. Jesse Lee, *A Short History of the Methodists in the United States of America* (Baltimore: Printed by Magill and Cline, 1810), pp. 178-80. Emory Stevens Bucke *et al.*, eds., *The History of American Methodism* (3 vols.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1964), I, 440-52.

16. Grissom, *Methodism in N. C.*, pp. 175-93. Bucke *et al.*, eds., *History of American Methodism*, I, 441-49, noting especially the rhetoric and images of O'Kelly's *Apology* (1798).

17. Bucke *et al.*, eds., *History of American Methodism*, I, 443-45. Grissom, *Methodism in N. C.*, pp. 186-90.

18. Grissom, *Methodism in N. C.*, p. 185. Bucke *et al.*, eds., *History of American Methodism*, I, 451-52.

19. Cf. n. 2, *supra*. *Minutes*, I, 25-26, 41, 46-8.

20. Coke, "Journal," *Arminian Magazine*, I, 341-42, 344, 345, 392, 393, 394. See Devereux Jarratt, *Thoughts on Some Important Subjects in Divinity* (Baltimore: Warner & Hanna, 1806), pp. 75-78.

21. Coke, "Journal," *Arminian Magazine*, I, 391-92. Leroy M. Lee, *The Life and Times of the Rev. Jesse Lee* (Louisville: John Early, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1848), pp. 159-70.

22. Asbury, *Journal and Letters*, II, 283-84, 324, 325, 326, 380, 456, 457, 493, 590, 628.

23. *Ibid.*, II, 46, 108, 109, 591.

24. Tise, *Yadkin Melting Pot*, pp. 37, 42, 46. Adelaide L. Fries *et al.*, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina* (11 vols.; Raleigh: N. C. Department of Archives and History, 1922-1969), IV, 1804, 1805-07; V, 2089, 2266, 2306, 2314; VI, 2570, 2623, 2627, 2628, 2635.

25. Tise, *Yadkin Melting Pot*, pp. 51-3. Fries *et al.*, eds., *Records of the Moravians*, VI, 2717, 2771, 2773, 2783, 2794, 2814-15, 2838, 2840, 2850; VII, 3110.

26. Fries *et al.*, eds., *Records of the Moravians*, VI, 2804, 2830. See also Lorenzo Dow, *The Life Travels, Labors, and Writings of Lorenzo Dow* (N.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 162.

27. Tise, *Yadkin Melting Pot*, pp. 61-64. Fries *et al.*, eds., *Records of the Moravians*, VII, 3136-37, 3147, 3295, 3317, 3368, 3387, 3501, 3506.

Chapter Four — N. Fred Jordan

1. [Francis Asbury], *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*, Elmer T. Clark, Editor-in-chief (Vol. I, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), 358. Hereafter this source will be cited as JLFA.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*, 11.

4. A. W. Cummings, *The Early Schools of Methodism* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1886), p. 426. Cf. W. L. Grissom, *History of Methodism in North Carolina* (Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1905) Vol. I, 135. The early date of 1790 suggested by Cummings has not been confirmed by this research. 1793 is a more likely date for the opening of the school, making it one of the first if not the first district school. See below p. 6.

5. *Minutes of the Methodist Conferences Annually held in America; from 1773 to 1813, Inclusive* (New York: Daniel Hitt and Thomas Ware, for the Methodist Connection in the United States, 1813), Vol. I, 141. Cokesbury College also received the special appointment in 1794 of Joseph Everett as chaplain.

6. The McClaskey commonplace book has been returned to members of the Ellis family, but photostatic copies are in the archives of the Western North Carolina Conference of the United Methodist Church at Charlotte, North Carolina, and a microfilm has been made by the local records division of the North Carolina Department of Archives and History.

7. See JLFA II, 439 and below p. 9.

8. *Minutes of the Annual Conference 1773-1828,* Vol. I (New York: T. Mason and G. Lane, 1840), p. 257.

9. *Ibid.* This was John McClaskey's second marriage. Nothing is known of the first.

10. JLFA II, 767.

11. W. W. Sweet, *The Methodists, Religion on the American Frontier,* Vol. IV (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946), 48-9. The salary was twenty-four pounds (Pennsylvania currency).

12. See e.g. JLFA II, 423.

13. Sweet, p. 50. Cf. JLFA I, 325; II, 474; III, 196.

14. See e.g. John Owen Gross, *Methodist Beginnings in Higher Education* (Board of Education, The Methodist Church, 1959), p. 10. Cf. JLFA, 43-45.

15. JLFA III, 44.

16. *Ibid.,* I, 555.

17. Frank Baker, "John Wesley and Cokesbury College's First President," *Methodist History,* Vol. XI, No. 2 (Jan., 1973), pp. 54-59. For a description of Kingswood School see [John Wesley] *The Works of John Wesley* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1958-1959), Vol. XIII, 283-302.

18. Gordon Pratt Baker, ed., *Those Incredible Methodists* (Baltimore, Commission on Archives and History, The Baltimore Conference, 1972), p. 69.

19. JLFA I, 595-6. Cf. Bennett H. Young, *A History of Jessamine County, Kentucky* (Louisville: Courier-Journal Job Printing Co., 1898), p. 169, or Cummings, pp. 44-45.

20. JLFA III, 102-3.

21. See Grissom, p. 137.

22. F. A. Mood, *Methodism in Charleston* (Nashville: The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1856), p. 54.

23. Jerry O'Neil Cook, *The First Schism in American Methodism* (Unpublished Divinity School Research Paper, Durham: Duke University, The Divinity School, 1964).

24. See e.g. JLFA I, 595.

25. The Jones and a Parks family are tied together in the records of Mecklenburg County, Virginia. See e.g. *Virginia: Heads of Families at the First Census of the United States taken in the year 1790* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1908), p. 75, and Mecklenburg County, Virginia, *Will Book* No. 2, 1782-1788, p. 186.

26. Elizabeth is generally referred to as the daughter of Hardy Jones. Actually she was his sister-in-law. Following the death of her father, Martin Phillips, she went to live with her sister Sarah (Mrs. Hardy) Jones. On February 11, 1782, Hardy Jones was officially appointed her guardian. See Katherine B. Elliott (ed.), *Early Settlers of Mecklenburg County, Virginia* (South Hill: Published by the editor), Vol. II, 167. Hardy Jones, however, always thought of her as his daughter and included her as such in his will of March 25, 1819.

27. Cummings, p. 426.

28. Grissom, p. 137.

29. JLFA I, 776-777. Cf. *Minutes 1773-1813,* p. 141.

30. Wesley, *Works,* XIII, 291.

31. See advertisement in William Law, *An Extract from Mr. Law's Serious Call to a Holy Life by the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.* (Philadelphia: Hall and Dickens, 1793), p. 220.

32. Ernest Ashton Smith, *Allegheny—A Century of Education 1815-1915* (Meadville: The Allegheny College History Co., 1916), p. 69. His name was Valentine Cook. Cf. JLFA I, 716n.

33. JLFA III, 123. The name Bliss has been misread as Bless by the editors. See the original in the Drew University Library, Madison, N. J. The name McClaskey is spelled a variety of ways, including McClasky, McClosky, and M'Casky. McClaskey, however, is the spelling used in the commonplace book.

34. It seems more likely that McClaskey was at the college. In light of the shortness of his stay at the school in 1794, he had probably already returned home to Maryland in November of 1793. See below pp. 8, 9.

35. JLFA II, 26.

36. *Ibid.*, III, 305n.

37. Possibly Etheldred Ellis who later used McClaskey's commonplace book for his own financial records. See footnote #64.

38. Daniel Boone had grown up within a few miles of the school only twenty years earlier. In later life he called this section "the best hunting area he ever saw." James W. Hall, *History of Davie County* (Mocksville: Davie County Historical Publishing Association, 1969), p. 33.

39. These stones are all that remain of the building. The site is on the W. A. Bailey farm near Advance, North Carolina.

40. JLFA II, 11. Adequate doors and windows were still rare in 1794, but provided good lighting for classroom instruction. See Cummings, pp. 72-3.

41. See the catalog of Dickins' publications in William Law, *An Extract . . .*, p. 219.

42. JLFA I, 595.

43. *Ibid.*, II, 25, 208.

44. Minnie Zerrell Talbert Bryson, "Upon This Rock" (Typed manuscript in the Davie County Public Library, Mocksville, North Carolina, n.d.). This writer interviewed Mrs. Bryson at her home in Advance, North Carolina, on May 30, 1969. She again stated her strong belief that the United Methodist Church in Advance grew directly from the congregation at Cokesbury School.

45. JLFA III, 102.

46. [Charles Wesley] *Representative Verse of Charles Wesley,* Frank Baker, editor (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 143. Cf: *The Methodist Hymnal,* (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1964), #344.

47. JLFA II, 11. Asbury may have been referring to Bethel School in Kentucky, which was being built on a much larger scale. The size of Cokesbury School was more in keeping with his own plan for district schools.

48. On November 7, 1794, Hardy Jones was officially appointed guardian for Bird and Epps Hughes. See *Rowan County, Quarter Session of Inferior Court,* November 7, 1794.

49. *Ibid.*

50. While George and John are common Davidson names, Richmond appears only in Anson County. James Parks served the Anson circut in 1792 and supervised it as presiding elder in 1793. In 1886 Rev. M. H. Moore discovered on the Anson circuit a Latin-Greek grammar that had belonged to George McClaskey. It therefore seems likely that the Davidsons were from this area.

51. There were many Jarmons in North Carolina in 1794, but none were named Thomas. The 1790 census, however, records a Thomas Jarmon in Baltimore with one son under sixteen years of age. McClaskey refers in his commonplace book to "our passage from Baltimore." Jarmon may have accompanied him to the school.

52. This may have been *A Short Latin Grammar* which Wesley edited and first published in 1748 for use at Kingswood. See Frank Baker (compiler) *A Union Catalogue of the Publications of John and Charles Wesley* (Durham: The Divinity School, Duke University, 1966), p. 81.

53. Possibly a 1787 volume printed by Thomas Dobson in Philadelphia. See Charles Evans, *American Bibliography 1639-1820,* Vol. 7, (Chicago: Columbia Press, MDCCCCXII), 98, #20227.

54. *Ibid.,* Vol. 10, 17, #28272.

55. Possibly John Wesley's *A Short Greek Grammar* which he prepared for use at Kingswood School. See Baker, *A Union Catalogue,* p. 123.

56. In 1749 Wesley published *Cornelii Nepotis Excellentium Imperatorum Vitae* for use by the fourth class at Kingswood as an introductory reader in Latin. See *Ibid.,* p. 85.

57. This could have been Wesley's *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Colloquia Selecta* published in 1750. See Ibid., p. 92.

58. In 1794, Cokesbury School was part of Rowan County. Davie did not become a separate county until 1836.

59. The Methodist Book Concern first published *Primitive Physic* in 1791. In 1792 a second edition included *The Family Advisor* by Henry Wilkins. See Baker, *A Union Catalogue,* p. 76.

60. See Dickins' catalogue in William Law, *An Extract . . .,* p. 219. The recommended price was three shillings and nine pence, but McClaskey sold it to Snow for four shillings and six pence.

61. The Holden farm was adjacent to property owned by Hardy Jones and James Parks. See e.g. *Rowan County Deed Book* 14, p. 395; 15, p. 42; and 25, pp. 160-162. Edmund Holden's gravestone is still legible in a small cemetery near the site of Cokesbury School.

62. McClaskey actually recorded at this point in his commonplace book buying "1 pater (sic) of ink powder," but he later corrected his spelling in his itemized expense list. Wafers were used as seals on letters.

63. The identity of Mr. Bean is unknown.

64. His commonplace book was left with Etheldred Ellis, the son-in-law of George McKnight, whose meeting house was used for the important 1789 conference with the Kentucky Methodists. Ellis may also be the one to whom McClaskey loaned twenty shillings on his way to Cokesbury. Ellis was a "local Elder" and is said to have organized at least two Methodist churches—Mt. Pleasant near McKnight's and Mt. Pleasant at Stony Hill, Iredell County. Ellis also used the commonplace book for his financial records.

65. JLFA II, 35.

66. *Minutes, 1773-1813,* p. 152.

67. JLFA II, 208.

68. *Ibid.,* III, 103.

69. *Ibid.,* 62.

70. *Minutes 1773-1813,* pp. 232, 235, 245, and 260.

71. *The Baltimore American,* July 10, 1804.

72. JLFA II, 439. Italics added.

73. See e.g. *Rowan County Deed Book* 26, p. 788.

74. See e.g. *Anson County Deed Book* U, 520-21; V, 240, 310.

75. The move was a gradual one and no specific date can be given. See e.g. *Surry County Deed Book* I, 59, 263, 528-9, 529-30; P, 365; N, 77.

76. *The Laws of the State of North Carolina, Enacted in the year 1818* (Raleigh: Thomas Henderson, 1819), p. 90. Cf. The Industrial Edition, *The Elkin Tribune,* 1914.

77. *Minutes of the N.C. Conference of the M.E. Church, South* December 5-11, 1860 (Raleigh: Smother & Marcon, 1861).

78. Jesse Lee, *A Short History of the Methodists in the United States of America* (Baltimore: Magill and Cline, 1810), p. 197.

79. *Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church Vol. I 1796-1836* (New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1855), 208.

Chapter Five — Donald G. Mathews

1. In discussing the character of eighteenth century society and the role of the Methodists within it, I have been influenced by two articles by Rhys Isaac as well as my own research on religion in the nineteenth century South. See especially Rhys Isaac, "Religion and Authority: Problems of the Anglican Establishment in Virginia in the Era of the Great Awakening and the Parson's Cause," *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, 30 (January, 1973), 3-36 and his "Evangelical Revolt: The Nature of the Baptists' Challenge to the Traditional Order in Virginia, 1765 to 1775," *William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series, 31 (July, 1974), 345-68.

2. Donald G. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1844,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965, pp. 11-12.

3. William K. Boyd, editor, "A Journal and Travels of James Meacham, Part I May 19 to August 31, 1789," *Historical Papers* (Trinity College Historical Society) Series IX (1912), 94.

4. Noble Tolbert, "Daniel Worth: Tar Heel Abolitionist," *North Carolina Historical Review,* 39 (July, 1962), 284-304.

5. William Andrew Smith, *Lectures on the Philosophy and Practice of Slavery as Exhibited in the Institution of Domestic Slavery in the United States,* Nashville: Stevenson and Evans, 1856.

6. Charles Force Deems, *The Home-Altar: An Appeal in Behalf of Family Worship with Prayers and Hymns for Family Use,* New York: M. W. Dodd, 1851, pp. 29-32.

7. L. S. Burkhead, "History of the Difficulties of the Pastorate of the Front Street Methodist Church, Wilmington, N. C. for the Year 1865," *Historical Papers* (Trinity College Historical Society) Series VIII (1908-9), 43.

8. *Ibid.,* pp. 66-118.

9. L. S. Burkhead, editor, *Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina . . .,* Raleigh: John Nichols, p. 254.

10. See *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* December 5, 1860, p. 1.

11. *Ibid.,* April 2, 1863, p. 1.

12. *Ibid.,* March 10, 1859, p. 1; December 25, 1860, p. 2.

13. *Minutes of the Local Ministers Association for North Carolina,* twenty-first session, Raleigh: n.p., 1891, p. 6.

14. Daniel Jay Whitener, *Prohibition in North Carolina, 1715-1945,* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945, pp. 47-109.

15. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism,* pp. 135, 182, 274-5, 277-8.

Chapter Six — Ralph E. Luker

1. Tillett, the Dean of Vanderbilt University's School of Religion, was the son of John Tillett, a North Carolina Methodist itinerant pastor and slaveholder; Atkins, founder and president of the State Normal College for Negroes at Winston-Salem, was the son of Allen Atkins, whose master was John Tillett.

2. "Son of Slave-Holder and Son of His Slave Now Fellow-Members of the Council," *Federal Council Bulletin* (December-January, 1923), pp. 17-18. Quoted

in Lester H. Collums, *Wilbur Fisk Tillett: Christian Educator* (Louisville, 1949), pp. 16-17.

3. On Northern Methodist missions, see: Ralph E. Morrow, *Northern Methodism and Reconstruction* (East Lansing, 1956); Henry M. Johnson, "The Methodist Episcopal Church and the Education of Southern Negroes" (unpublished dissertation, Yale University, 1939); and Frank Kenneth Pool, "The Southern Negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church" (unpublished dissertation, Duke University, 1939). On the African Methodist missions, see: J. Beverly F. Shaw, *The Negro in the History of Methodism* (Nashville, 1954); George A. Singleton, *The Romance of African Methodism: A Study of the African Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York, 1951); Charles S. Smith, *A History of the African Methodist Episcopal Church . . . from 1856 to 1922* (Philadelphia, 1922); and David H. Bradley, *A History of the A. M. E. Zion Church, 1872-1968* (Nashville, 1970).

4. Hunter Dickinson Farish, *The Circuit Rider Dismounts: A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865-1900* (Richmond, 1938), pp. 66-68, 78-81, and 189; and Kenneth K. Bailey, *Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1964), p. 5.

5. "Editorial Notes," *The Independent,* XLII (February 13, 1890), 217. See also: "Editorial Notes," *The Independent,* XLII (March 13, 1890), 349; and "Editorial Notes," *The Independent,* XLII (June 5, 1890), 781. For other signs of declining, but persistent, tension, see: "Bishop Mallalieu and North Carolina," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLI (November 13, 1895), 8-9.

6. Wilbur Fisk Tillett, "The White Man of the New South," *The Century,* XXX (March, 1887), 769.

7. Quoted in Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts,* pp. 197-198, and 203.

8. On Southern anti-missionism, see: Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "The Anti-mission Movement in the Jacksonian South: A Study in Regional Folk Culture," *Journal of Southern History,* XXXVI (November, 1970), 501-529. For a different interpretation of the Haygood-Miller debate, see: H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image, But . . .: Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910* (Durham, 1972), pp. 277-280.

9. See, for example: Atticus G. Haygood, *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future* (New York, 1881); Oscar P. Fitzgerald, "A Good Book, But Obsolete," *Methodist Quarterly Review,* new series XIII (October, 1892), 62-64; Charles B. Galloway, "Ollections [sic] for Colored Education," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (August 1, 1894), 1; and "Eyes Opening," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XL (July 24, 1895), 1.

10. Farish, *Circuit Rider Dismounts,* pp. 196-197.

11. R. C. Beaman, "Missionary Work Among the Negroes of the South," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (August 8, 1894), 2. See also: Tempe L. King, "Our Duty to the Negroes," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (October 24, 1894), 3.

12. S. Lea, "Missionary Work Among the Negroes of the South," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (September 5, 1894), 3.

13. "Negroes Off for Liberia," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (November 21, 1894), 1; and "Editorial Comment," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XL (August 7, 1895), 1. For the larger, sad story of black emigration to Africa in these years, see: Edwin L. Redkey, *Black Exodus: Black Nationalist and Back-to-Africa Movements, 1890-1910* (New Haven, 1969).

14. John F. Ford, "The Exodus of the American Negro," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIV (August 16, 1899), 2-3. See also: "Editorial Notes," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (May 4, 1904), 8-9. While there are elements of racism in Ford's relegation of black men to Africa, he vigorously repudiated extreme forms of racism popular at the turn of the century. See:

John F. Ford, "Is 'The Negro a Beast?'" *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (October 12, 1904), 4-5, a review of Charles Carroll's *'The Negro a Beast,' or 'In the Image of God'* . . . . (St. Louis, 1900).

15. "Another Lynching," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (April 11, 1894), 1; "A Lynching Averted," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (June 6, 1894), 1; "Horrible Outlawry in Mississippi," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (September 5, 1894), 1; "Lynchers Indicted," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (September 12, 1894), 1; "England's Concern About Southern Lynchings," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (September 19, 1894), 1; "Lawlessness," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XL (March 20, 1895), 1; "Wretched Barbarism," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XL (October 23, 1895), 1; and "Lawlessness," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLII (September 29, 1897), 1.

16. "Editorial Comment," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XL (June 12, 1895), 1; and "A Disgraceful Occurrence," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XL (August 7, 1895), 3.

17. "'On Fire of Hell,'" *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XXXIX (November 1, 1894), 1.

18. "The Remedy for Lynching," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLI (April 22, 1896), 1.

19. "Mob Law," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLII (September 1, 1897), 1.

20. E. A. Yates, "'Effect of Emancipation Upon the Mental and Physical Health of the Negro,'" *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLII (January 6, 1897), 2.

21. "The Late Revolution in 'The City by the Sea,'" and "The Result of the Last Election," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIII (November 16, 1898), 1 and 9; "The State Election is Over," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLV (August 8, 1900), p. 8; and "Advice Given in Kindness," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLV (November 7, 1900), 8. These events are well treated in: Hugh T. Lefler and Albert R. Newsome, *The History of a Southern State: North Carolina.* Third Edition (Chapel Hill, 1973), pp. 550-562.

22. "Rudyard Kipling's New Poem, 'The White Man's Burden,'" *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIV (February 1, 1899), 4.

23. "Extreme Views Hurtful," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (July 6, 1904), 2-3. See also: "Our Distinguished Visitors," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVI (April 24, 1901), 8; "A New Federal Policy for the South," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVI (October 16, 1901), 9; "Gradually Dawning," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVII (October 29, 1902), 1; "Time to Call a Halt," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVIII (February 4, 1903), 8; "The Negro a National Issue," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVIII (November 11, 1903), 2; and "Governor Aycock on the Negro Problem," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (February 10, 1904), 2; "Booker Washington Talks Sense," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIV (March, 1904), 6. On the education movement in North Carolina, see: Louis R. Harland, *Separate, But Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915* (New York, 1968).

24. "Greatly Deplored," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIV (May 3, 1899), 8, and "The Akron, Ohio, Riot," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLV (September 5, 1900), 8.

25. "Is There No Remedy for Lynching?" *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVI (August 21, 1901), 8. See also: "Lynching Bee in Ohio," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (March 16, 1904), 2; "A Contagion of Lawlessness" and "Sane Views on the Race Question," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,*

XLIX (March 23, 1904), 2-3; "Dr. Kilgo at Los Angeles," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (May 25, 1904), 8; and "A Shameful Record," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (August 24, 1904), 8.

26. "Swift Justice," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVIII (October 21, 1903), 2.

27. Wendell H. Stephenson, "The Negro in the Thinking and Writing of John Spencer Bassett," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XXV (October, 1948), 428-430.

28. John Spencer Bassett, "North Carolina Methodism and Slavery," *An Annual Publication of Historical Papers, Published by the Historical Society of Trinity College,* Ser. 4 (Durham, N. C., 1900), 11.

29. See, for instance: John Spencer Bassett to Herbert Baxter Adams, November 15, 1898 and February 18, 1899, in William Stull Holt, ed., *Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert Baxter Adams* (Baltimore, 1938), 257-259 and 265; and John C. Kilgo, "An Inquiry Concerning Lynching," *South Atlantic Quarterly,* I (1902), 4-13.

30. John Spencer Bassett, "Stirring Up the Fires of Race Hatred," *South Atlantic Quarterly,* II (October, 1903), 301.

31. John Cline, "Thirty-Eight Years of the Southern Atlantic Quarterly" (unpublished thesis, Duke University, 1940), pp. 49-122. Unaccountably, Cline failed to include the *Christian Advocate* among the dissenters.

32. The Bassett affair is skillfully interpreted in Bruce Clayton, *The Savage Ideal: Intolerance and Intellectual Leadership in the South, 1890-1914* (Baltimore, 1972), pp. 84-101.

33. "A Personal Statement," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVIII (December 9, 1903), 8. See also: "The Bassett Matter and the Action of the Trustees of Trinity College," *ibid.,* 8-9; "Forbearance Misconstrued," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLVIII (December 23, 1903), 8; and "Hasty Public Sentiment," *ibid.,* 9.

34. "The Race Question Again," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (June 21, 1906), 1. See also: "The Duty of the M. E. Church, South, to the Negro," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* XLIX (August 17, 1904), XLIX (August 17, 1904), 2-3; and the nostalgia of the Reverend M. H. Moore, "Mammy: A Memory of the Old Plantation," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* L (December 7, 1905), 2-3.

35. "A Great Time at Tuskegee," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* L (April 12, 1906), 2; "Booker Washington on the Negro," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (September 6, 1906), 1; and "Governor Heyward and the Clansman," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* L (October 19, 1905), 1.

36. "The Lawless Spirit," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (July 12, 1906), 8. See also: "Dr. Kilgo on Mobocracy," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (September 6, 1906), 8.

37. "A Terrible Tragedy," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (July 19, 1906), 8; and "The End of the Tether," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (August 16, 1906), 1.

38. "Riot in Atlanta," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (September 27, 1906), 1; and "The Aftermath," *North Carolina Christian Advocate,* LI (October 11, 1906), I. On the Atlanta riot, see: Charles Crowe, "Racial Massacre in Atlanta, September 22, 1906," *Journal of Negro History,* LIV (April, 1969), 150-168.

39. William J. Northen, "The Negro Situation—One Way Out," *World Today,* XIII (1907), 893-896. See also: H. H. Proctor, "A Southerner of the New School: William J. Northen," *Southern Workman,* XLII (1913), 403-406.

40. George Peter Antone, Jr., "Willis Duke Weatherford: An Interpretation of His Work in Race Relations, 1906-1946" (unpublished dissertation, Vanderbilt

University, 1969); and Wilma Dykeman, *Prophet of Plenty: The First Ninety Years of W. D. Weatherford* (Knoxville, 1966). Neither Antone nor Dykeman explore the relationship between Northen and Weatherford.

41. Willis Duke Weatherford, *Negro Life in the South* (New York, 1910). See also: Antone, "Willis Duke Weatherford," pp. 25-53.

42. Willis Duke Weatherford, *Present Forces in Negro Progress* (New York, 1912), pp. 183, and 54-55.

43. See: Antone, "Willis Duke Weatherford," *passim.*, Dykeman, *Prophet of Plenty, passim.*; Earl Charles Chatfield, "The Southern Sociological Congress, 1912-1920: The Development and Rationale of a Twentieth-Century Crusade" (unpublished thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1958); and Edward Flud Burrows, "The Commission on Interracial Cooperation, 1919-1944: A Case Study in the History of the Interracial Movement in the South" (unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1954).

44. Smith, *In His Image, But . . .*, p. 305; and John O. Fish, "Southern Methodism and the Accommodation of the Negro, 1902-1915," *Journal of Negro History*, LV (July, 1970), 210.

Chapter Seven — Joseph B. Bethea

1. *The Journal of The Reverend John Wesley, A.M.* (2 vols. ed. by John Emory, New York: Carleton and Phillip), 1856, Vol. II, p. 12.

2. Carter G. Woodson, *The History of the Negro Church* (reprinted, Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers), 1972, pp. 48-49.

3. Gayraud S. Wilmore, *Black Religion and Black Radicalism* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Press), 1973, pp. 103-105.

4. John H. Graham, *Mississippi Circuit Riders 1865-1965* (Nashville: The Parthenon Press), 1967, p. 14; Cf. Elizabeth Lamb, *Historical Sketch of Hay Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Fayetteville, N. C.) 1934; Cf. William M. Wightman, *Life of William Capers, D.D.* (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House), 1859, pp. 124-129.

5. Marcia M. Mathews, *Richard Allen* (Baltimore: Helicon), 1963, p. 39.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

7. Richard Allen, *The Life Experience and Gospel Labors of the Rt. Reverend Richard Allen* (reprinted New York—Nashville: Abingdon Press) 1960, pp. 25-26.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

9. Daniel M. Baxter, *Bishop Richard Allen and His Spirit* (Philadelphia: The A.M.E. Book Concern), 1923, p. 70.

10. Bishop Daniel Alexander Payne, *Recollections of Seventy Years*, (New York: Arno Press), 1968, pp. 38-39.

11. *Minutes of the South Carolina Annual Conference of the African Methodist Church, First Three Sessions*—1865, 1866, 1867 (Reprinted by Bethel A.M.E. Church, Greensboro, N. C.).

12. Richard R. Wright, ed. *Centennial Encyclopaedia of the African Methodist Episcopal Church* (Philadelphia: Book Concern of the A.M.E. Church), 1916, p. 342.

13. *The Book of Discipline of the African Methodist Episcopal Church* (Nashville: The A.M.E. Sunday School Union), 1972, p. 202.

14. Alain Rogers, "The African Methodist Episcopal Church, A Study in Black Nationalism," *The Black Church Quarterly Journal* (Boston: The Black Ecumenical Commission of Massachusetts), 1972, Volume I, Number 1, pp. 17-41.

15. Bishop William J. Walls, *The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church: Reality of the Black Church* (Charlotte, N. C.: A.M.E. Zion Publishing House), 1974, pp. 51-83.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 149.
20. Bishop J. W. Hood, *One Hundred Years of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church* (New York: A.M.E. Zion Book Concern), 1895, pp. 289-301.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 295.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 396-397.
23. Walls, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-191.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.
25. *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church*, 1970 Edition (Memphis, Tenn.: C.M.E. Publishing House), n.d., p. VIII.
26. Bishop C. H. Phillips, *The History of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America* (Jackson, Tenn.: C.M.E. Publishing House), 1925, pp. 28-29.
27. Othal H. Lakey, *The Rise of "Colored Methodism"* (Dallas, Texas: Crescendo Book Publications), 1972, p. 125.
28. *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South,* for the Year 1869 (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House), 1870, p. 312.
29. *Journal of the Twenty-Third Session of the North Carolina Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Held in Newbern, North Carolina, November 24-30, 1869* (Raleigh, N. C.: The Raleigh Episcopal Methodist), 1869, pp. 18, 25.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
31. Phillips, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
33. Robert O. Langford, *Memoirs of My Life* (n.p.), 1966, p. 9.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
35. *Minutes of the One Hundred and Second Session of the Carolina Annual Conference, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church* (n.d., n.p.), pp. 52, 76-80.
36. W. L. Grissom, *History of Methodism in North Carolina* (Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the M.E. Church), 1905, pp. 222, 223, 235.
37. *Official Journal of the North Carolina Annual Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church,* 1936, p. 40.
38. Elmer T. Clark, *Methodism in Western North Carolina* (The Western North Carolina Conference, The Methodist Church) 1966, p. 78.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.
40. *Minutes of the North Carolina Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1879,* p. 15.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
42. E. O. Thayer, "Letter from North Carolina" *Zion's Herald* (Boston: Boston Wesleyan Association) February 20, 1879, Volume LVI, Number 8, p. 58.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
44. Bishop Willis J. King, "The Negro Membership of the (Former) Methodist Church in the (New) United Methodist Church," *Methodist History,* (Lake Junaluska, N. C.: The Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church) April, 1969, pp. 32-43.

Chapter Eight — Robert T. Osborn

1. *Early Methodism in the Carolinas* (Knoxville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church South, 1897), pp. 158f.

2. A.M.E. Zion separated officially in 1820 in New York after a struggle for independence that began in 1796. In Philadelphia the A.M.E. church began its struggle for independence in 1787 and held its first delegated conference in 1820. The M.E. Church South separated in 1844, and the colored M.E. Church separated from the M.E. Church South in 1870, provision having been made by the M.E. Church South in 1866.

3. See Robert Chiles, *Theological Transition in American Methodism:* 1790-1935. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 32ff. Chiles is a basic source for the survey of Methodist theology in America, outlined in the section, "The Common Text," *Supra,* pp. 15ff.

4. See John Spencer Bassett, *Slavery in North Carolina* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1899), pp. 57-60. Bassett reminds us that it was Evans who brought Methodism to Fayetteville, North Carolina.

5. W. W. Sweet, *Methodism in American History,* rev. ed. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), p. 339.

6. William J. Walls, *The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church* (Charlotte: A.M.E. Zion Publishing House, 1974), pp. 316-19.

7. Walls states that the original North Carolina Conference of A.M.E. Zion was "the pioneer in our great Southern work and the mother of the conferences of the South." (Walls, p. 186). The remarkable achievement of the North Carolina Conference, which is the home of Zion's only four year college, Livingstone College, and Hood Theological Seminary, its only seminary, was the achievement of the remarkable Bishop James Walker Hood, who must stand out as North Carolina's most distinguished Methodist in the last half of the nineteenth century. (Walls, *Passim*)

8. Most important among these is Thomas O. Summers, *Systematic Theology* (Nashville: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1888). I would also mention Thomas N. Ralston, *Elements of Divinity,* ed. T. O. Summers (Nashville: H. H. Redford, 1876); R. H. Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy,* ed. T. O. Summers (Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church, South, 1860); George Smith, *Elements of Divinity,* rev. by T. O. Summers (Nashville: H. H. Redford, 1875).

9. See *Chiles,* p. 49.

10. Chiles contends that the context of theology makes little difference, arguing that "no marked theological differences are to be traced to the separation [of the Southern M.E. Church]" (*Ibid.*) I will seek to show that Chiles is very wrong at this point.

11. For this survey see *Chiles,* pp. 38-49.

12. The result was, according to Chiles, that his "ultimate allegiance was to evidence external to Scripture itself." (*Chiles,* p. 48).

13. Wesley came to America in 1736, though Methodism appears to have arrived between 1760-65. It was the first religious body in America to work out an independent organization in 1784. See *Sweet,* pp. 51, 100.

14. See C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (New York: Oxford University Press, A Galaxy Book, 1957), pp. 3-4. He notes the breaks in southern history and suggests that therefore "the people of the South should be the last to expect indefinite continuity. . . ." However, it is a thesis of this paper that therefore they were most keenly to desire it, and what the world could not give they hoped the church might.

15. As we shall note later, there was no place in the white past for the black.

16. In order to be able to cherish this past, a defense had to be made of slavery. This was notably provided by R. H. Rivers' *Elements of Moral Philosophy* (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1860), a book that remained in the conference course of study as late as 1878. In the preface the author commends his work because it gives "a full and correct view of the slavery question" and shows that it "is not a sin; that it was established originally by the Divine Being, for wise, just, and benevolent purposes. . . .," xviii.

17. See H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image, But . . .* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1972), pp. 269-73.

18. See W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), p. 54.

19. See *Summers,* pp. 100-103. William H. Moore of North Carolina testifies in this vein that "there are fundamental principles underlying and controlling everything. . . ." (*Sermons of William H. Moore,* Duke University Archives, Sermon 9, ca. 1890).

20. *Summers,* pp. 70-109, esp. 103-107. The Reverend Moore says that "God reveals himself to us as an absolutely perfect being" who, because of our sin, finds it necessary to withdraw "from peaceful intercourse with men." (Sermon 9)

21. "Immutability appears to be the rule in the history of God's universe; mutability the exception. . . ." (The Reverend M. V. Sherrill in *North Carolina Sermons,* Levi Branson, ed., 1886, II, 63).

22. In this spirit the Honorable John Staples of Greensboro on the occasion of the 1876 Raleigh celebration of the centennial of Methodism spoke of the stability of the Church in contrast to "the ever changing and decaying institutions of human genius" (L. S. Burkhead, ed., *Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina,* 1876, pp. 325f).

23. Sermon 12, Duke University Archives.

24. Address of 1878.

25. *Ibid.*

26. "Systematic theology may here be compendiously defined as *the scientific form* of the truths of revelation." (*Summers,* p. 19).

27. See *Chiles,* pp. 158-175.

28. *Summers,* p. 259.

29. *Summers,* p. 265. Note the use of the word "exact."

30. The Reverend L. S. Burkhead in *North Carolina Sermons* I, 9.

31. The Reverend Thomas S. Campbell in *North Carolina Sermons* II, 129.

32. Burkhead, *Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina,* p. xx.

33. The Reverend J. W. Jenkins in *North Carolina Sermons,* III, 258-265. His vision of Philemon reminds him that "this beautiful Southland was once noted for its princely hospitality. The world knew nothing to beat it." (262f).

34. Burkhead, *Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina,* p. xx.

35. *Ibid.,* p. xxf.

36. The Honorable John Staples in Burkhead, *Centennial of Methodism in North Carolina,* pp. 340f. He earlier observes that when "we contemplate its [the Church's] beginning, we are lost in the eternity of God, when we dwell upon its triumph and history upon earth we are filled with the profoundest conviction of its divine appointment; when we consider its destiny we confess the immortality of the human's soul," (328). In the words of the Reverend G. A. Oglesby, "Methodism is the grandest fact in this great country of ours," (*North Carolina Sermons* III, 269). Also cf. *ibid.,* pp. 173-179.

37. *Sermons of J. Braxton Craven.* Duke University Archives, No. 795.

38. *Sermons of William C. Moore,* Duke University Archives, Sermon No. 3, ca. 1894.

39. The Reverend W. S. Rone, *North Carolina Sermons* III, 82.

40. William J. Walls, *The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church* (Charlotte: A.M.E. Zion Publishing House, 1974), p. 100. This phrase fairly well captures the distinctive spirit of black Methodist theology in North Carolina in the nineteenth century. Bishop Allen, a founding Father of the A.M.E. Church, had a similar vision, when he said that "it had often been impressed on my mind that I should one day enjoy freedom. . . ." Quoted by Daniel A. Payne, *The History of The A.M.E. Church.*

41. See Bishop James Walker Hood, *One Hundred Years of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church* (New York: A.M.E. Zion Book Concern, 1895), pp. 13ff. The first two chapters of this book on "Early Race Distinctions" and "The Negro Race" forcefully witness what I designate as the distinctive "pretext" of black theology.

42. "It is the impression with many that the Negro has no history to which he can point with pride. There could be no greater mistake than this. If it had been in the power of modern historians of the Caucasian race to rob him of his history, it would have been done. But the Holy Bible has stood as an everlasting rock in the black man's defense. God himself has determined that the black man shall not be robbed of his record which he has made during the ages. . . . At every step in this investigation we see plainly the hand divine interposed in our behalf. . . ." *Ibid.,* p. 34. See also Ch. II in its entirety, *ibid.,* pp. 27-55.

43. "The Bible is the only book which gives certain satisfactory information respecting the future of man." Bishop James W. Hood, *Sermons,* II, 19.

44. Cf. *Walls,* p. 537.

45. "The anguish attendant upon human sorrow he endured, hungering as we hunger, weeping as we weep—amazing paradox of heaven! Positively human, absolutely divine." The Reverend Joshua Brockett of the A.M.E. Church in North Carolina, *Sermons,* III, 101. "With pitying eyes, the prince of peace beheld our helpless grief. He saw, and Oh amazing love He flew to our relief." Quoted by Bishop Hood, *Sermons,* II, 19.

46. Sin is measured by the divine righteousness which, says Bishop Hood, "will be exercised in the interest of human happiness. Racial and class prejudice . . . will have no place in that righteous reign. . . . They shall not oppress the weak . . . neither shall they grind the life out of the poor." Bishop Hood, *Sermons,* II, 9.

47. Bishop Hood of North Carolina addressed an 1898 session of the New York Annual Conference of the Zion Church on "The State of the Nation"—a topic without parallel among his white peers. He began in defense of mixing politics with religion: "Even though I be charged with mixing politics with religion, I will not refrain. . . . The rights of my people are not regarded in every part of this land as they should be. . . ." (*Official Journal of the New York Annual Conference,* A.M.E. Zion Church, New York, 1888, p. 6.)

48. Hood, *Sermons,* II, 19.

49. *Ibid.,* pp. 89f.

50. *Ibid.,* p. 89.

51. The Reverend Joshua Brockett, "The Atonement" in *North Carolina Sermons,* III, 99.

52. *Ibid.,* p. 100.

53. *Ibid.*

54. *Ibid.*

55. *Ibid.,* p. 105.

56. James E. Mason, "Developing the Spiritual Life," *The Star of Zion* (July, 1896).

57. Hood, *One Hundred Years of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church,* pp. 65f.

58. *Ibid.,* p. 497.

59. See *Walls,* pp. 99f., and Hood, *One Hundred Years of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church,* p. 156.

60. See *Walls,* p. 301.

61. Hood, *Sermons,* II, 134. A.M.E. Zion fought the good fight within its own ranks, and Hood can properly boast that "this church was the first among Methodist Episcopal Churches to grant the laity representation in the Annual and General Conferences" and was "first in granting to woman that recognition to which she is entitled. In 1884 the word 'male' was stricken from the Discipline. . . ." (p. 159)

62. Thus Bishop Hood could recommend a kind of Marshall plan to help and heal the wounded post-bellum South. He observed that "the failure to pay the slaveholder for the property in human flesh taken from him, was the greatest possible injustice to the freed men." He therefore proposed that the federal Government "take from its treasury a sufficient amount of the troublesome millions [taken from the South by emancipation] to pay for emancipation and apply it to the purpose." His concern was for the black freed men, a concern which thus also included his white antagonists. Hood, *Official Journal of the New York Annual Conference,* 1890, pp. 9, 12.

63. *Minutes of the New England Annual Conference of the A.M.E. Zion Church,* 1890, p. 34.

64. Members of the Philadelphia and Baltimore Annual Conference, 1889, were reminded that "the Church of God by the highest obligations and in obedience to sacred call, is in duty bound to use what influence it possesses to not only spread holiness . . . but to induce the nation to provide for the rights of its citizens, that justice everywhere shall be dealt out without partiality and without delay." *Minutes,* p. 51.

65. John J. Tigert, *A Voice From the South* (Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church South, 1892), p. 29.

66. *Ibid.,* p. 30.

67. Hood, *One Hundred Years of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church,* p. 14.

68. *Ibid.,* p. 19.

69. This is true of both Walls and Hood, *One Hundred Years of African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church,* who for example devote lengthy sections to the story of the Bishops (Hood, chs. III and VI, *Walls,* pp. 565-628).

Chapter Nine — Albea Godbold

1. Elmer T. Clark (Editor), *Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury.* (Nashville: Abingdon Press), 1958, Vol. I, 324, 358.

2. Asbury, Vol. II, 77. A Cokesbury School, the first conference school in America, was established on the Yadkin River in Davie County, N. C., sometime prior to 1793. It was later converted into a meetinghouse. (Asbury, Vol. I, 358; Vol. II, 11, 208).

3. *Encyclopedia of World Methodism.* (Nashville: United Methodist Publishing House), 1974, Vol. I, 680-681.

4. Asbury, Vol. II, 77.

5. See the writer's, *The Church College of the Old South.* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1943), 32-35.

6. *General Conference Journal, M. E. Church,* 1816, 149.

7. *Ibid.*, 1820, 183, 208.
8. *Ibid.*, 1840, 140.
9. *Ibid.*, 162.
10. The oldest is Wesleyan College (1836), Macon, Ga.
11. W. H. Moore, *Life and Labors of the Rev. H. G. Leigh* (pamphlet, 1896).
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. Nora C. Chaffin, *Trinity College, 1839-1892.* (Durham, Duke University Press), 1950, 13; *MS Minutes* of the N. C. Conference, M. E. Church (M. E. Church, South after 1844), 1838-1860.
15. *MS Minutes,* N. C. Conference, 1840.
16. Godbold, *op. cit.,* 44-45; *MS Minutes,* N. C. Conference, 1838.
17. See William K. Boy in Introduction to Chaffin, *op. cit.,* 12-13.
18. See Chaffin, *op. cit.,* and Godbold, *op. cit.,* for accounts of the rise of Trinity College.
19. N. H. D. Wilson, II told the writer many years ago that his father, who was a Trinity College trustee for years, had no confidence in Craven and therefore sent his son to the University at Chapel Hill.
20. See Robert F. Durden, "The Origins of the Duke Endowment and the Launching of Duke University," *N. C. Historical Review,* Spring, 1975, 130-146.
21. The conference journals include the names of some "colleges" which survived only a few years at most, such as Asheville Female College, Hayesville College, and Wesleyan Female College at Murfreesborough. Assuming that such institutions were little more than short-lived academies, no accounts of them are given.
22. Sources for data pertaining to the colleges include *Journals* of the North Carolina and Western North Carolina conferences, 1838-1974 and 1890-1974, respectively; J. Elwood Carroll, *History of the N. C. Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church,* (Greensboro: McCulloch and Swain), 1939; Elmer T. Clark, *Methodism in Western North Carolina,* (Nashville: Parthenon Press), 1966; *Encyclopedia of World Methodism,* 2 vols.; etc.
23. The two cities pledged over $4,000,000, and within five years had raised nearly $3,000,000 for the colleges.
24. The writer served as pastor of College Place Church, 1928-1931, and of University Church, Chapel Hill, 1931-1934.
25. In May 1975 the chairman of the board of trustees of N. C. Wesleyan College announced that unless large amounts of money were forthcoming soon, the college would have to close by fall. The N. C. Conference met and voted to try to raise $400,000 at once to save the institution.

DATE DUE

APR 1 4 1988

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A

ELON COLLEGE LIBRARY
287.6756 M566in
Methodism alive in North Carol
0 2927 0119362 8
792200

287.6756
M566in
792200